



United States Department of State

United States Participation in the UN

Report by the President
to the Congress
for the year 1986



United States Department of State

United States Participation in the UN

Report by the President
to the Congress
for the year 1986



DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 9557

Bureau of International Organization Affairs

Released September 1987

Contents

Acronyms and Short Forms.....	xiii
PART 1. Political and Security Affairs	
Security Council.....	1
General Assembly.....	3
Peaceful Settlement	5
Middle East.....	5
Security Council Consideration	5
Situation in the Occupied Territories	5
East Jerusalem.....	5
West Bank.....	7
Situation in the Middle East	8
Lebanon	8
Israeli Interception of Libyan Aircraft.....	9
Conflict Between the United States and Libya.....	10
Security Council Consideration	10
Gulf of Sidra Clash	11
Situation in the Mediterranean	12
U.S. Bombing of Libya	13
Situation in Southern Africa.....	14
Libyan Aggression Against Chad.....	15
Security Council Consideration	15
Libya.....	16
General Assembly Consideration	16
UN Interim Force in Lebanon	17
UN Disengagement Observer Force.....	19
General Assembly Consideration	19
Israeli Credentials.....	19
Situation in the Middle East	20
Question of Palestine	22
Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories.....	24
Cooperation between United Nations	
and the League of Arab States.....	27
Armed Israeli Action Against Iraqi Nuclear	
Installations.....	28
Cooperation Between the United Nations and the	
Organization of the Islamic Conference.....	29
UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in	
the Near East.....	29
Conflict Between Iran-Iraq	31
Security Council Consideration	31
Chemical Weapons.....	31
Security Council October Resolution	32

UNGA Consideration	33
Afghanistan.....	33
Cambodia	34
Credentials at the General Assembly	34
General Assembly Consideration	34
South African Policies of Apartheid and Related Issues	35
Security Council Consideration	35
South African Policies of Apartheid	37
General Assembly Consideration	37
World Sanctions Conference	41
Comorian Island of Mayotte.....	42
Malagasy Islands	43
Cooperation Between UN and Organization of African Unity.....	43
General Assembly Consideration	43
Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question	43
Situation in Central America.....	45
Security Council Consideration	45
General Assembly Consideration	46
International Court of Justice: Nicaragua	47
Nicaragua Trade Embargo.....	47
Emergency Assistance to El Salvador.....	48
Cyprus.....	48
Disarmament and Arms Control	49
Disarmament Commission	49
Conference on Disarmament	51
Ad Hoc Committees	52
Chemical Weapons.....	52
Outer Space Arms Control	53
Radiological Weapons	53
Comprehensive Program of Disarmament.....	54
Negative Security Assurances	54
Other Issues	54
Nuclear Test Ban	54
Prevention of Nuclear War, Including All Related Matters....	55
Membership	55
General Assembly.....	56
Prevention of Nuclear War.....	58
Radiological Weapons	59
Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space	60
Israeli Nuclear Armament.....	61
Verification and Compliance	61
Bilateral Nuclear Arms Negotiations.....	63

Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons.....	64
Nuclear Freeze	65
Chemical and Biological Weapons.....	66
Comprehensive Test Ban	68
Cut-off of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes	70
World Disarmament Campaign.....	71
Reduction of Military Budgets	72
New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction.....	73
Negative Security Assurances.....	74
Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones	76
Indian Ocean Zone of Peace.....	78
Nuclear Winter	80
Disarmament and Development	81
Comprehensive Program of Disarmament.....	82
Confidence-Building Measures and the CDE.....	82
Institutional Issues	84
Antarctica	86
South Atlantic Zone of Peace.....	88
Outer Space	89
Scientific and Technical Subcommittee.....	89
Legal Subcommittee	90
Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.....	90
General Assembly	91
Law of the Sea	92
General Political Problems.....	94
Membership.....	94
Question of Peacekeeping	94
Peacekeeping Guidelines	94
General Assembly	94
Efforts Toward Strengthening the United Nations.....	95
Charter Committee	95
General Assembly	95
Committee on Information (COI).....	96

PART 2. Economic, Social, Scientific, and Human Rights Affairs

Introduction	99
The Critical Economic Situation in Africa.....	101
International Development Strategy	102
Long-Term Trends in Economic Development.....	103
Economic Commission for Europe.....	104
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	105
Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean.....	107
Economic Commission for Africa	108
Economic Commission for Western Asia	109

United Nations Development Program.....	110
Governing and Advisory Bodies	111
Secretariat and Field Organization	111
Program Development	112
Patterns of Development Assistance.....	112
Activities and Analysis	112
United Nations Industrial Development Organization	114
Introduction.....	114
New Status	114
UNIDO Meetings.....	114
Investment Promotion Service	116
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade	117
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	118
Economic Cooperation Among Developing Countries (ECDC)	120
Transfer of Technology	121
Code on Restrictive Business Practices.....	121
Protectionism and Structural Adjustment.....	122
Substantial New Program of Action (SNPA).....	123
Commission on Transnational Corporations	123
United Nations Children's Fund	125
1986 Session of the UNICEF Executive Board	128
Americans in UNICEF.....	129
UNICEF Expenditures in the United States	130
Human Settlements Activities.....	130
Population Activities	132
World Food Council	133
Social Issues.....	134
Crime Prevention and Control.....	134
Committee on Crime Prevention and Control	134
Drug Abuse Control	136
Commission on Narcotic Drugs	137
Draft Convention Against Drug Trafficking.....	137
Control of Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking and Production	138
Drug Scheduling.....	139
International Narcotics Control Board.....	140
United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.....	141
International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT)	141
UN Disaster Relief Coordinator (UNDRO).....	143
Reform of UNDRO.....	145
UN High Commissioner for Refugees	145
International Legal Protection	146
General Assembly	146

UNHCR Programs	150
Africa.....	151
Asia	151
Europe and North America.....	151
Latin America.....	152
Southwest Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East.....	152
International Cooperation to Avert New Flows of Refugees	152
Aging	153
Disabled.....	154
Youth.....	154
United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).....	154
Environment in the UNGA.....	157
Harmful Products	157
UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation	160
New and Renewable Sources of Energy (NRSE)	161
Science and Technology for Development	162
University for Peace	164
UN University	164
UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).....	165
Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.....	167
Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance	167
Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East.....	168
Racial Discrimination in South Africa	168
Self-Determination	170
Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights.....	172
Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment.....	174
Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments.....	175
Rights of the Child.....	175
Human Rights of Migrant Workers	175
Rights of Minorities.....	176
Human Rights Defenders	176
Review of the Work of the Subcommission.....	176
Violations of Human Rights	177
Human Rights in Chile	180
Advisory Services	181
Measures Against Totalitarian or Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination.....	181
Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights	182
Regional Arrangements.....	183
Science and Technology	183
Status of Women	185
Commission on the Status of Women	185

First Regular Session of the Economic and Social Council ..	188
Second Regular Session of the Economic and Social Council	191
Forty-First Session of the UN General Assembly	191
Expert Group Meeting on Violence in the Family	194
Specialized Agencies	195
World Bank Group.....	195
IDA and IBRD FY 1985 Lending Program	195
International Finance Corporation	197
International Monetary Fund.....	197
International Fund for Agricultural Development	199
World Food Program.....	201
Food and Agriculture Organization.....	203
Food and Agriculture Organization Council.....	204
The Regional Conferences	204
Other Meetings.....	205
UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	206
World Heritage Convention	208
International Geological Correlation Program	208
Universal Copyright Convention	209
Man and the Biosphere Organization	209
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission	211
U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.....	212
World Intellectual Property Organization	212
Administrative Organization.....	212
Technical Activities.....	213
Assistance to Developing Countries	214
Revision of the Paris Convention	214
Patent Cooperation Treaty.....	216
Brussels Satellite Convention.....	216
Protection of the Olympic Symbol.....	217
World Health Organization.....	217
Health Issues	219
AIDS.....	219
Immunizations.....	220
Guineaworm	220
Smoking.....	220
Pharmaceuticals	220
Infant Feeding.....	221
Health for All.....	222
Chernobyl Follow Up	222
Other Health Matters.....	223
Administrative and Budgetary Issues.....	223

Political Issues.....	225
Action Regarding Israel	226
International Year of Peace	227
African Issues	228
Morocco Regional Assignment	228
Chemical War	228
Pan American Health Organization	229
International Agency for Research on Cancer	230
International Maritime Organization	231
Assembly.....	231
Council	231
Maritime Safety Committee (MSC)	232
Legal Committee	232
Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC).....	232
International Civil Aviation Organization	233
ICAO Council	233
ICAO Assembly	236
Third Meeting of the Future Air Navigation Systems (FANS) Committee	237
International Telecommunication Union	238
Administrative Council 41st Session	238
Center for Telecommunications Development	239
Panel of Experts	240
International Telecommunication Union Technical Bodies	241
International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT)	241
International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR)	241
International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB)	242
Universal Postal Union (UPU).....	243
Executive Council	243
Consultative Council for Postal Studies	243
International Labor Organization.....	244
The Governing Body	244
ILO Annual Conference.....	246
Technical Agenda Items	246
Additional Resolutions.....	247
Other Political Issues.....	249
World Meteorological Organization.....	250
Executive Council	250
Major Programs	251
World Weather Watch	251
World Climate Program	252
Hydrology and Water Resources Program.....	252
Research and Development.....	253
Technical Cooperation	253

Voluntary Cooperation Program	253
Education and Training.....	254
Budget	254
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)	255
Chernobyl and the IAEA.....	256
Board of Governors.....	256
General Conference.....	257
IAEA Programs	258
Safeguards.....	258
Technical Cooperation	259
General Assembly	260
Part 3. Trusteeship and Dependent Areas	
Introduction	263
Special Committee (Committee of 24)	264
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI)	265
Trusteeship Council Consideration	267
U.S. Territories	269
Special Committee Consideration.....	269
American Samoa	269
Guam	269
U.S. Virgin Islands.....	270
General Assembly Action	270
Namibia	271
Security Council Consideration	271
General Assembly Consideration	272
Puerto Rico	276
Western Sahara	277
New Caledonia	278
Other Questions	279
Fourth Committee Resolutions	279
Plenary Action	280
Part 4. Legal Developments	
Introduction	283
International Court of Justice.....	283
Nicaragua v. United States of America	284
International Law Commission.....	284
Work of the Commission's 38th Session.....	285
General Assembly Action	286
International Trade Law	286
Work of the Commission's 19th Session.....	286
General Assembly Action	288
Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind	289

Non-Use of Force in International Relations	290
Special Committee.....	290
General Assembly.....	291
Protection of Diplomats.....	291
International Convention Against Mercenary Activities.....	292
Strengthening International Security	293
Host Country Relations	296
Protection of Persons Under Detention or Imprisonment.....	299
Development of Principles Concerning International	
Economic Relations.....	300
Foster Placement and Adoption of Children.....	300
Part 5. Budget, Administration, and Institutional Management	
Introduction	303
UN Reform	305
Current Financial Crisis of the UN	308
UN Budget.....	309
Audit Reports.....	310
Financing Peacekeeping Operations.....	312
Institutional Matters.....	313
Scales of Assessment.....	313
Committee for Program and Coordination	315
Revisions to the Medium-Term Plan	315
Program Performance for 1984-85	316
Review of Evaluation Activities	316
Cross-Organization Program Analyses (COPA)	317
Improving the Work of CPC.....	318
Joint Inspection Unit (JIU)	319
Committee on Conferences.....	321
International Civil Service Commission	322
Personnel Questions	323
UN Pension System.....	324
Employment of Americans.....	326
Appendices	
Address by President Reagan at the 41st Regular	
Session of the General Assembly	329
Principal Organs of the United Nations.....	337
United States Missions.....	343
United States Representatives	347
Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of	
the Expenses of the United Nations	355

Acronyms and Short Forms

AID	U.S. Agency for International Development
ACABQ	Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
ACC	Administrative Committee on Coordination
Committee	Special Committee on the Situation with Regard of 24 to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
CD	Committee on Disarmament
CIEC	Conference on International Economic Cooperation
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
EC	European Communities
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
ECWA	Economic Commission for Western Asia
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GATT	General Agreement on Traffic and Trade
G-77	Group of 77
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMCO	Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
NASA	U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OAS	Organization of American States
OAU	Organization of African Unity
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization

SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization
UNCITRAL	UN Commission of International Trade Law
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UNDC	UN Disarmament Commission
UNDOF	UN Disengagement Observer Force
UNDP	UN Development Program
UNEF	UN Emergency Force
UNEP	UN Environment Program
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFICYP	UN Force in Cyprus
UNHCR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNIDO	UN Industrial Development Organization
UNIFIL	UN Interim Force in Lebanon
UNITAR	UN Institute for Training and Research
UNRWA	UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UNSCEAR	UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

Part I

Political and Security Affairs

Since the United Nations was founded in 1945, its main purpose has been the promotion of international peace and security. This remains the centerpiece of the UN system.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Charter gives the Security Council and the General Assembly authority to consider threats to the peace. Primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security rests with the Security Council. The Charter authorizes the Council to act to achieve peaceful settlement of disputes (Chapter VI), and to deal with threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression (Chapter VII). The Council can only make recommendations for actions on matters raised under Chapter VI. In areas covered by Chapter VII, however, it may take decisions—including imposition of collective political, economic, and military sanctions—which, in theory at least, are binding on all Member States.

The 15-member Council functions continuously, meeting as necessary. The Charter gives a special role to the five Permanent Members—China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States. A negative vote by a Permanent Member constitutes a veto of any substantive Council action, in the event that such action (usually a draft resolution) receives at least 9 positive votes. Council decisions on procedural matters require 9 or more positive votes for adoption. They are not vetoable, but in these cases the Council usually operates by consensus.

The other 10 Council members are elected by the General Assembly; by tradition, they represent regional blocs. These 10 members serve overlapping 2-year terms; 5 members are elected each year. The 5 members for the 1986–1987 term are: Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela; for the 1987–1988

term: Argentina, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Zambia.

The Council has created several UN peacekeeping and peace-monitoring operations to help carry out its responsibilities. Five such units existed in 1986: the UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP); the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights between Israel and Syria; the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), stationed in southern Lebanon; the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), located in Israel and other Middle East countries; and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP). These operations were launched and deployed under the authorization of the Council; that authorization remains the basis for their existence. In 1978 the Council also authorized creation of a UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to help the Special Representative of the Secretary-General ensure the early independence of Namibia through free and fair elections. Though composition of UNTAG has been agreed upon, its formation awaits final agreement on a Namibia settlement in accordance with Security Council Resolution 435 (1978).

The Security Council held 91 meetings in 1986, compared to 74 in 1985. Most of these meetings concerned the Middle East. The Council passed 13 resolutions (1985 total: 21); 9 were adopted unanimously and 1 by consensus. The United States voted for 10 of these resolutions and abstained on 3. In terms of peacekeeping forces, the Council passed resolutions which renewed UNIFIL twice (April 18, July 18), UNDOF twice (May 29, November 26), and UNFICYP twice (June 3, December 11). The United States supported all extensions of these mandates. Neither UNTSO nor UNMOGIP requires periodic renewal by the Council.

Twelve vetoes were cast in the Council in 1986. Eight of these were by the United States: 2 on Nicaragua, 2 on South Africa, 2 on Israel, 1 on Lebanon, and 1 on Libya. The United Kingdom joined the United States in vetoing two resolutions on South Africa. France and the United Kingdom joined the United States in vetoing the resolution on the U.S. raid on Libya.

The Council was convened five times on African issues, four involving complaints against South Africa and one involving Chad. The Council adopted two resolutions on South Africa, with the United States abstaining on one of them.

Council consideration of the Iran-Iraq war focused on the use of chemical weapons and efforts to end the conflict. The United States supported statements by the Council President on these matters. On other Middle Eastern issues, the United States vetoed resolutions on Israeli practices on Jerusalem's Temple Mount, Is-

rael's interception of a Libyan aircraft, southern Lebanon, and condemnation of the U.S. bombing raid on Libya; abstained on a resolution calling for an end to foreign military presence in southern Lebanon and on a resolution deploring Israeli military handling of a West Bank demonstration in Bir Zeit; and supported a statement of concern by the Council President on the rising tide of violence against UNIFIL in southern Lebanon.

Nicaragua called four Council meetings to air complaints against the United States. The United States subsequently vetoed two Nicaraguan draft resolutions related to the ICJ decision of June 27.

Regarding terrorism, the Council authorized a Presidential statement condemning the September hijacking incident in Karachi.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Except for the anomalous situation of the Delegation of South Africa, whose credentials have not been accepted since 1970, all UN Member States are currently represented in the General Assembly. The Assembly meets annually from mid-September to late December. After 3 weeks of general debate, the work of the Assembly takes place in seven main committees and in plenary. Political issues are handled in several forums: arms control and disarmament in the First Committee; broad political issues in the Special Political Committee and the plenary; human rights in the Third Committee; and dependent territories and decolonization questions in the Fourth Committee.

The 41st General Assembly convened on September 16, 1986, and was suspended on December 19, 1986. President Reagan addressed the plenary on September 22, the fourth year in a row that he has spoken to the fall session of the General Assembly. Of the 314 resolutions and decisions adopted by the Assembly during its 41st Session, the United States joined consensus on 159, abstained on 35, did not participate on 3, and cast yes or no votes on 160. The Assembly decided 200 issues by vote.

A major goal of the United States at the 41st General Assembly was to combat the practice of name-calling: i.e., gratuitous criticism of the United States by name in Assembly resolutions. Through parliamentary maneuvers and lobbying, the United States was able to defeat some texts and induce sponsors to withdraw others. In the plenary Assembly, in 13 votes requested by the United States on passages containing explicit or implicit

name-calling, the United States succeeded in having 10 pejorative references deleted.

Middle Eastern and southern African issues again dominated the political agenda of the 41st General Assembly. The United States supported plenary decisions to reject overwhelmingly the challenge to Israeli credentials and reaffirm strong resolutions on Afghanistan and Cambodia (Kampuchea). There was no plenary discussion of Puerto Rico or Micronesia. The body of disarmament resolutions was mixed, but the United States was pleased with passage of resolutions it initiated on chemical weapons use and on the importance of compliance with arms-control agreements. Consideration of Antarctica failed to restore the consensus practice that had prevailed for several years before breaking down in 1985. Joined by many countries from all regional groups, the United States declined to participate in voting on the three Antarctica resolutions, whose effect, if not their intent, would be to undermine the Antarctic Treaty system. (Resolutions 41/88A, 41/88B, 41/88C)

The United States voted against two resolutions related to U.S. policy regarding Nicaragua, both of which passed, but joined consensus on the resolution on peace in Central America. The United States supported a successful resolution on the Falklands (Malvinas) issue.

On the Middle East, the Assembly adopted by large margins 18 resolutions: 3 dealing with the general situation in the region; 4 on the question of Palestine; 7 on Israeli practices in the occupied territories; and 1 each on the 1981 Israeli raid on the Iraqi reactor, the U.S. retaliatory strike on Libya, cooperation between the United Nations and the Arab League, and cooperation between the United Nations and Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC). With the exception of the resolution on the OIC, the United States voted against or abstained on all resolutions, in most instances because they did not promote the quest for a just and lasting peace in the region and suffer from lack of balance and a strident tone.

The Assembly also adopted 11 resolutions on UNRWA, the UN relief operation for Palestinian refugees in the Middle East. The United States cosponsored one of these texts, which expressed concern for the continued plight of the Palestinian refugees, and called for increased contributions to UNRWA and extended the mandate of UNRWA until June 30, 1990. In all, the United States voted for two of the texts, joined consensus on two others, and voted "no" on the other UNRWA resolutions.

The Assembly adopted 13 resolutions on southern Africa, 8 under the item, "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa" and 5 under the item the "Question of Namibia." While restating firm opposition to apartheid in any form, the United States abstained on or voted against 6 of the 8 resolutions on South Africa because of their extreme, confrontational tone, abstained on 1, and joined consensus on 1. In line with its standard practice as a member of the Namibia Contact Group, the United States abstained on the five resolutions involving Namibia.

On items concerning Cambodia (Kampuchea) and Afghanistan, the United States joined very large General Assembly majorities in adopting resolutions seeking to end Vietnam's occupation of Cambodia and the Soviet Union's occupation of Afghanistan. In 1986 there was no challenge to the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.

In the Fourth Committee, the United States achieved its objectives of blocking any General Assembly initiatives on Puerto Rico or Micronesia. The Committee and the Plenary approved acceptable resolutions on American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Arms control and disarmament once again generated the largest number of resolutions in the 41st General Assembly. The First Committee handled most of this work, examining a record 74 resolutions and decisions, all of which were adopted in plenary. The United States participated actively in these deliberations, mobilizing support successfully for its initiatives on chemical-weapons use and compliance with international agreements.

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Middle East

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

Situation in the Occupied Territories

The Security Council had two occasions in 1986 to deal with the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

East Jerusalem

During a visit to the Temple Mount area of Jerusalem on January 8, some Israeli citizens (including a few parliamentarians) attempted to engage in religious activities banned by agreements on practices in Holy Places in Jerusalem. These incidents

(and two similar ones later in the month) led to violent confrontations with Muslims in the Temple Mount area. Israeli authorities acted quickly to defuse the situation, and the Israeli Government criticized the actions of the offending Israeli citizens. Nonetheless, UN delegations of several Islamic countries pressed for a Security Council meeting on the subject. On January 16, Morocco, as head of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), and the United Arab Emirates, as the Arab member of the Security Council, formally requested a Security Council meeting.

In response to this request, the President of the Security Council for January (the Chinese Permanent Representative) held informal consultations with the other Security Council members on January 17. Although the United States and some other members of the Council argued that a formal meeting should be postponed until there was a clearer understanding of the facts of the case, the majority of the Council insisted upon setting an immediate date for formal debate. The President then scheduled a formal meeting of the Council on the issue for January 21.

The Security Council debated the Temple Mount incidents on January 21, 22, 27, 28, and 30. A long list of speakers condemned Israel over both the specific incidents and Israeli policies as the occupying power of East Jerusalem. The Israeli Representative rejected the Arab charges and attributed the debate to ulterior motives of the PLO. He reiterated that existing agreements on religious practices in the Holy sites would be upheld, but made it clear that Israel considered all of Jerusalem its capital and part of its sovereign territory.

In the meantime, the Arab States circulated a draft resolution highly critical of Israel. The United States found the resolution unacceptable because it held the Israeli Government responsible for the incidents, ignored Israeli efforts to deal with them, and addressed the broader questions of the status of Jerusalem and Israeli responsibilities as an occupying power. We and the other Western members of the Council strongly expressed our preference for a Security Council Presidential statement rather than a resolution, or at least a more balanced and moderate resolution. The Arab States refused to consider a Presidential statement and although they agreed to some moderation of their text, it remained unacceptable to the United States.

The Arab states formally tabled their draft on January 29 and it came to a vote on January 30. The United States cast a veto. The final vote was 13 in favor, 1 against (U.S.) and 1 abstention (Thailand). In her explanation of vote, U.S. Representative Patricia Byrne made it clear that the U.S. Government "deplores

recent acts by certain individuals . . . who participated in disturbances" on the Temple Mount, and stated that "the United States would have certainly joined in a consensus statement or resolution reaffirming the universally acknowledged significance of the Holy Places, calling for respect and tolerance, stressing the importance of protecting and preserving these revered places and ensuring that members of all faiths have unrestricted access.

. . . We deeply regret that the Council chose not to follow this path." The United States had to veto the resolution submitted to the Council because "it gives the unmistakable impression that the Government of Israel is to blame for the provocative actions of a few individuals." Ambassador Byrne pointed out, moreover, that the resolution "is also designed to use these incidents as a pretext for addressing larger issues of the status of Jerusalem and Israeli stewardship as an occupying power." She noted that the U.S. position on these questions remains unchanged, but that there was no justification for raising them in this resolution and "to do so is to abuse the function of this body for political reasons."

West Bank

In a clash with demonstrators on December 4 at the Bir Zeit University in the West Bank, Israeli Defense Force (IDF) gunfire killed two Palestinians and wounded several others. Zambia, speaking for the Non-Aligned Movement countries, requested a Security Council meeting on the incident. The Council met on December 5 and 8, with most speakers highly critical of Israel. The United Arab Emirates, on behalf of the Arab Group, tabled a strongly condemnatory draft resolution on December 4. The draft was greatly modified as a result of discussions between the United Arab Emirate, the United States, and the other Western countries on the Council. The final resolution "strongly deplored the opening of fire by the Israeli army, resulting in the death and wounding of a number of defenseless students," but was balanced by a paragraph "calling on all concerned parties to exercise maximum restraint to avoid violent acts and to contribute towards the establishment of peace." The resolution was adopted December 8 by a vote of 14 to 0, with the United States abstaining. The U.S. Delegation made no explanation of vote. (Resolution 592)

Situation in the Middle East

Lebanon

The Security Council acted on two occasions in 1986 on events in Lebanon. The first responded to Lebanese complaints about a security sweep in South Lebanon undertaken in early January by the Israeli Defense Force (IDF) and the Israeli-sponsored Army of South Lebanon (ASL). The complaints focused particularly on allegations that the Israelis had expelled from their homes the inhabitants of the village of Kounin. The Secretary-General issued a statement on the subject January 10, in which he said that the IDF and ASL had ordered the villagers to leave their homes following nearby attacks on the two forces by unknown assailants. He noted that the Israelis, in response to contacts by the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), had stated that they had no objection to the return of the villagers, but the villagers were unwilling to go back until their safety could be ensured.

On the same day, the Lebanese Delegation requested scheduling of a formal meeting of the Security Council to debate the matter, and the delegation also circulated a harsh draft resolution condemning "the Israeli aggression, practices, and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon." In response to this request, the Security Council met on January 13, 14, and 17. Most speakers during the debate strongly criticized Israel, while the Israelis rejected charges that they had expelled the Kounin villagers and contended that they were forced to take military actions in South Lebanon because of attacks on ASL soldiers and the shelling of Israeli towns near the border. Speaking for the United States in a right of reply, Ambassador Herbert Okun rejected Soviet charges that U.S. policy in the Middle East was controlled by Israel. He declared that these charges were "totally without foundation and devoid of any content. Such assertions, of course, cannot harm the United States. They only bring those who make them into disrepute and harm the important work of this Council."

Efforts to persuade the Lebanese to withdraw their draft resolution or substantially alter it having failed, the resolution was brought to a vote on January 17. The vote was 11 to 1 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. A permanent member (the U.S.) having cast a negative vote (i.e., a veto), the resolution failed. In her explanation of the U.S. vote, Ambassador Patricia Byrne stressed that the United States "has demonstrated repeatedly its unwavering commitment to the restoration of Lebanon's unity, security, and independence," but that it was "precisely our attachment to the cause

of peace in Lebanon that compels us to cast a negative vote." This resolution, she continued, "cannot bring us closer to restoration of peace in Lebanon or to relieving the suffering of the Lebanese." Moreover, it "fails to deal in a fair and balanced manner with the security problems of southern Lebanon, including the security of the Lebanon-Israel border," because it ignores the fact that "in recent weeks there have been rocket attacks on Israeli territory from Lebanese soil." She concluded that "negative one-sided resolutions such as this one only serve those who wish to prevent progress toward peace in the region" and called upon all parties "to work in serious, practical ways to help build the mutual trust that alone can end the cycle of violence that has so tragically and needlessly ravaged the Middle East."

The second occasion for Security Council action on Lebanon occurred on December 2, when the President of the Council issued a statement on behalf of the Council members on recent fighting in and around the refugee camps in Lebanon. Native Lebanese militia forces, concerned that PLO guerrillas were trying to make a comeback in Lebanon, were laying siege to the camps and preventing the delivery of food and other necessities. The Security Council statement "appealed to all concerned to exercise restraint in order to end these acts of violence."

Israeli Interception of Libyan Aircraft

On February 4 the Israeli Air Force intercepted and forced down in Israel a Libyan civilian aircraft en route to Syria. The Israelis believed the aircraft to be carrying terrorists. When the Israelis discovered that they were mistaken, they released the plane within a few hours.

In an initial reaction to the interception, the Secretary-General issued a statement indicating his deep concern "at what appears to be a serious infringement of freedom of civil aviation . . ." At the request of the Syrian Permanent Representative, the Security Council met on the incident on February 4, 5, and 6. During the debate, the Syrians and other delegations harshly attacked the Israeli action, demanding that the Council strongly condemn "Israel's act of piracy and terrorism." Several speakers also held the United States indirectly responsible for the incident because of its general support for Israel. The Israeli Permanent Representative rejected the Arab charges, contending that the Israeli action was within the limits of a nation's right to legitimate self-defense and arguing that "the sanctity of human life takes precedence over the sanctity of airspace."

The Syrians circulated a draft resolution February 5 strongly condemning the Israeli action and calling on Israel to desist from such actions in the future. The United States opposed the resolution on the grounds that, while we did not believe that Israel had adequate grounds for the interception, the resolution did not address the overriding issue of terrorism in a balanced way and did not recognize that there were certain instances in which aircraft interceptions could be justified. Efforts by the United States and other Western members of the Security Council to moderate the Syrian draft proved largely unsuccessful. Therefore, the United States vetoed the resolution when it came to a vote on February 6. The vote was 10 to 1 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions.

In his explanation of the vote, Ambassador Vernon Walters stated that, although the United States opposed Israel's action in this case, the resolution was unacceptable because "it does not take into sufficient account the need to address practically and appropriately the overriding issue, terrorism." While as a general principle the United States opposes interception of civilian aircraft, he continued, "we believe there may arise exceptional circumstances in which an interception may be justified. . . . The United States recognizes and strongly supports the principle that a state whose territory or citizens are subjected to continuing terrorist attacks may respond with appropriate use of force to defend itself against future attacks. . . . We believe a state should intercept a civilian aircraft only on the basis of the strongest and clearest evidence that terrorists are on board," but "because we believe that the ability to take such action in carefully defined and limited circumstances is an aspect of the inherent right of self-defense recognized in the UN Charter, my Government cannot accept a resolution which implies that interception of an aircraft is wrongful *per se* without regard to the possibility that the action may be justified."

For further information on this issue, please see the section of this publication on the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

Conflict Between the United States and Libya

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

The UNSC had three occasions in 1986 to deal with disputes between the United States and Libya.

Gulf of Sidra Clash

U.S. Naval forces in the Mediterranean conducted routine exercises in March in the Gulf of Sidra, claimed as territorial waters by Libya but recognized as international waters by virtually all other states. After several minor incidents, Libya sent a letter to the Secretary-General on March 24 drawing attention to the "provocative military maneuvers" by the United States in the Gulf and stating that, because of the U.S. veto power in the Security Council, "Libya has no other choice in protecting its security and integrity than to resort to its own strength."

On March 25 Libyan naval vessels and a land-based missile complex attacked U.S. Forces, which only retaliated after several missiles had been launched. In the ensuing action, Libyan naval vessels were sunk or disabled and key components of the missile complex was damaged. The United States immediately informed the president of the Security Council of the incident and that, in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter, our forces had "exercised their right of self-defense by responding to hostile Libyan attacks in international waters in the Gulf of Sidra." The report was circulated as a document of the Security Council.

At the request of the Soviet Union and Malta, the Council debated the incident in meetings on March 26, 27, and 31. At the March 26 meeting only the Soviet, Maltese, and U.S. Representatives spoke. The Soviet Ambassador accused the United States of "armed aggression," "state terrorism," and "criminal conduct." The Maltese statement was much more restrained, but also critical. Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Vernon Walters declared that the SC was meeting because "Libya has flouted international law and the Charter of the United Nations by using lethal force to assert its claim in the Gulf of Sidra," a course foreshadowed in its March 24 warning to the Council (see above) to "resort to its own strength" to protect its "rights" in the Gulf.

After recounting the events of March 25, Walters went on to say that the United States rejected "Libya's efforts to subvert—by force—the international legal right of freedom of navigation and the responsibility of this Council under the Charter." He also rejected Libya's claim to control navigation in the Gulf, which "has no basis in international law, and everyone in this chamber knows it," and emphasized that "these flagrant Libyan attacks against naval units of the United States . . . were entirely unjustified and unprovoked." Walters added that "I want to make clear that any further attack also will be resisted by force, if required." He stressed that the real issue before the Council was the grave challenge to freedom of navigation in international waters

posed by the Libyan action. "By entering the Gulf of Sidra, the United States was defending freedom of navigation for all nations," he continued. "Therefore, members of the Council should affirm that freedom by forthrightly condemning those who seek to deny it."

In the March 28 and 31 sessions, a long list of Soviet bloc, Arab, and other non-aligned states attacked the United States as the provocateur in the incident, while the United Kingdom supported the U.S. position with a strong statement defending the right of freedom of navigation in international waters. Ambassador Walters twice used his right of reply to point out that the Libyans had fired the first shot.

From the beginning of the debate, several resolutions strongly condemnatory of the United States were being circulated by the Soviets, the Arab Group, and the Non-Aligned Movement. Because of their harshness, however, and the fact that the United States had ended its naval exercises in the Gulf of Sidra, the sponsors of these resolutions were unable to obtain commitment of the nine Security Council votes they needed to force a U.S. veto. Thus no resolution was tabled and the debate ended with the March 31 session.

The Situation in the Mediterranean

On April 12 the Maltese Permanent Representative asked for an urgent meeting of the Security Council "to prevent the use of force in the Mediterranean." At the same time, Malta began circulating a draft resolution which was unacceptable to the United States because it suggested that the cause of tension is the U.S. naval presence in the Mediterranean and did not mention the use of force by Libya. The Council met briefly that evening to hear a Maltese statement calling for restraint in the eastern Mediterranean, without mentioning either the United States or Libya, and for Malta to introduce its draft resolution.

A second meeting was held April 14 to allow statements by the Soviet, Libyan, and U.S. Representatives. Libya criticized the Security Council for its failure to adopt a resolution during the Gulf of Sidra debate, and thereby "encouraging new acts of aggression" by the United States. The Soviet Ambassador launched a bitter attack against the United States, referring to the "dirty cloud of blackmail rising from the Potomac" and the "clenched fist of the U.S. fleet" ready to strike in the Mediterranean.

In his response, U.S. Ambassador Vernon Walters declared that what the Council "is faced with is a persistent course of conduct by a member state, Libya, in flagrant disregard of the most

fundamental rules of international law.” He reiterated the right of the United States under Article 51 of the UN Charter to respond in self-defense to military attacks against it. He noted that Libya had not reported the justification for its missile attack on U.S. vessels to the Council, as required by Article 51, but had provided only “invective, polemics, protestations of innocence and whining arrogance. We are faced with a regime which considers itself outside the law, which considers itself unrestricted by the Charter, which considers itself unaffected by global condemnations of terrorism, and considers itself evidently without any obligation to honor the rules of civilized conduct and human rights.

... The Council will not be facing its responsibilities nor will it ease tensions if it seeks to avoid the root cause of the problem:

... the murderous behavior of the Government of Libya and its agents.”

The Council was scheduled to meet again on this subject April 15, but the debate was preempted as a result of the U.S. bombing of Libyan military installations on April 14 (see below).

U.S. Bombing of Libya

On April 14 U.S. Forces conducted a limited strike on selected Libyan military sites. The attack was in response to unequivocal evidence that the Libyan Government had planned and ordered terrorist bombings in Berlin and Paris targeted at Americans, and was planning further such attacks. As required by Article 51 of the UN Charter, the United States immediately informed the president of the Security Council of our exercise of our right of self-defense and its justification.

On April 15 Libya, Burkina Faso, Syria, and Oman, requested an immediate meeting of the Security Council to address the situation. The Council met on April 15, 16, 17, and 21. The United Arab Emirates, Libya, and the United States spoke at the morning session of the Council on April 15. The UAE and Libya were highly critical, with the latter attacking the United States for its “barbaric, savage raids” and also singling out the United Kingdom for supporting U.S. “aggression” (since some of the aircraft involved were based in Britain).

Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Vernon Walters described the bombing raid and detailed the reasons for it, declaring that “the murderous violence of recent Libyan attacks makes clear why the United States had to act.” He then emphasized that “the scourge of Libyan terrorism is not a problem for the United States alone. It threatens all members of the civilized world community. It challenges all members of this Council to give meaning

to their commitment to uphold the principles of the Charter and to act in the common defense of those principles. . . . It is hypocrisy to equate the answer to terrorism with terrorism. . . . Libyan attacks are . . . a clear assault on international order, an assault on the Charter of the United Nations and the principles which we, as members of this Council, are pledged to defend."

Almost all of the speakers in the Council sessions on the afternoon of April 15 and on April 16 and 17 were critical of the United States, except for Australia and the United Kingdom, who strongly laid blame for international terrorism on Libya. Meanwhile, the five non-aligned Council members (Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Arab Emirates) submitted a draft resolution April 17 which "strongly condemns the armed attacks by the United States." The draft came to a vote on April 21, when it failed due to veto by the United States, Britain, and France—the first triple veto by the permanent Western members of the Council in 5 years. The other two Western members of the Council, Australia and Denmark, also voted against the resolution. The final vote was 9 to 5, with 1 abstention.

In his explanation of vote, Ambassador Walters rejected the draft resolution as totally unacceptable because of "its assumption that the essential problem before us stems from the actions taken by the Armed Forces of the United States against Libya. That is a false assumption, contradicted by the facts, by irrefutable evidence, and by the long and tragic list of countries which have suffered brutality after brutality at the hands of Libyan terrorism. . . . To endorse such an erroneous and deficient draft would be to mock the oft-stated commitment of this body . . . to oppose terrorism in all its forms as criminal conduct that must be resisted and punished." In addition, he continued, we see in the draft "a harmful and potentially disastrous approach that equates the use of terrorism with an act of justified self-defense against terrorism; an approach that condemns acts of the United States against Libya but ignores Libya's documented, open, undeniable use of terrorism. . . . This text is a product of perverted thinking that distorts logic, values, and common sense. . . . We expect all nations of good will and true commitment to the values and principles of this organization to stand with us."

Situation in Southern Africa

As a result of a raid carried out on May 19 by the South African Defense Forces against the capitals of Zimbabwe, Botswana,

and Zambia, the Senegalese, as president of the Organization of African Unity, called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. Debate began on May 22 and ended the following day after 32 speakers spoke in three separate sessions. Without exception, all speakers roundly condemned South Africa for violating its neighbors' borders. The South African Permanent Representative recalled that his government had warned 5 months earlier that it would take action against neighboring governments if a joint mechanism between South Africa and its neighbors to reduce tensions was not established and acts of violence (carried out by the African National Congress) continued.

Ambassador Okun, in his right of reply and, later, his explanation of vote, flatly rejected charges that U.S. actions against Libya earlier in the year had opened the door to the South African raids. Mr. Okun described the raids as "a body blow to the efforts of the United Nations, the Commonwealth, the Front Line States, and my own government to bring about a political system in South Africa based on the consent of the governed." The draft resolution, sponsored by the NAM members of the Council, was vetoed by the United States and the United Kingdom because it sought to impose selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The final vote was 12 to 2 (U.S., UK), with 1 (France) abstention.

LIBYAN AGGRESSION AGAINST CHAD

Security Council Consideration

On November 17, during informal consultations, the Security Council agreed to hold a meeting to hear a Chadian complaint against Libya. The Libyan occupation of territory and towns in the north of Chad, coupled with Libyan attacks against Chadian Government forces, are what prompted Chad to call for a meeting. The single meeting on November 18 saw four speakers, including the United States, take the floor in favor of Chad's contention that it was suffering under Libyan aggression and occupation. One speaker, the Congo—as OAU President—urged reconciliation between Chad and Libya. The U.S.S.R. and Libya accused "outside powers" of interfering in Chadian domestic affairs.

In his statement, U.S. Deputy Permanent Representative Okun praised the Chadian Government for attempting to "heal the wounds caused by the long civil war in that country." He accused Libya of aggression and of occupying Chadian soil. Okun recalled that already in February 1986, the Chadian Delegation had reminded the Security Council of Libyan attacks against Chad. He called on the Council to demand the withdrawal of Libyan forces

from Chad and voiced strong U.S. support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. No resolution was tabled during this debate.

Libya

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

During three meetings on November 19 and 20, the General Assembly debated a Libyan agenda item entitled "The Aerial and Naval Attack Against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya." During the debate, 41 speakers took the floor, some (mostly third world radical states) in defense of Libya and others (mostly Western States) critical of Libya's role in abetting and perpetuating international terrorism.

The debate grew out of U.S. actions against Tripoli and Benghazi, Libya on April 14-15, 1986. At a meeting of the General Committee* on September 16, the Libyans succeeded in having inscribed on the agenda of the 41st UNGA the additional item referred to above. At that time the U.S. Delegate on the Committee noted that the UNGA might wish at some future date to focus attention on "the role of the Libyan Government in aiding, abetting, and perpetuating international terrorism." The United States did not, however, formally object to inscription, based on the longstanding principle of general support for the inclusion of any given item on UNGA agendas.

The resolution, sponsored by 27 delegations drawn mainly from the East European Countries and radical NAM members, expressed "concern" that the Security Council had been "prevented from discharging its responsibilities due to the negative votes of certain permanent members." It condemned the "military attack perpetuated by . . . the United States" against Libya and called on the United States "to refrain from the use or the threat of the use of force in the settlement of disputes with the Jamahiriya." It requested the Security Council to remain seized of the matter. (The United States, the United Kingdom, and France had on April 21 vetoed a UNSC resolution condemning the United States for its April 14-15 actions.)

In his explanation of vote, Senator Larry Pressler, a member of the U.S. Delegation, catalogued a long list of Libyan actions in

*The main function of the 29-member General Committee is to review items for inclusion on the UNGA agenda and to recommend to the General Assembly for or against their inclusion.

the arena of international terrorism. He noted that it was only after many years of appeals and warnings that the United States had "found it necessary, in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter, to act in self-defense." (Article 51 refers to "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. The United States held Libya directly responsible for the bombing of the La Belle discotheque in West Berlin in which an American serviceman and a Turkish woman were killed.") Senator Pressler asserted that the U.S. response was proportionate, that the United States had direct proof of Libyan Government complicity in the La Belle bombing, and that the United States had a duty to respond. The vote on the resolution was 79 to 28 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions and 18 delegations not participating. The figure 79 represents half of General Assembly membership. (Resolution 41/38)

UN Interim Force in Lebanon

The attention of the Security Council was drawn to the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) on several occasions in 1986, including two instances where the UNIFIL mandate then in force would soon run out.

UNIFIL Renewal, April 18. The Security Council unanimously renewed the UNIFIL mandate. (Resolution 561) For the first time, the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European members of the Council voted for the extension of the mandate, rather than abstaining, and indicated that they would begin payment of their UNIFIL assessment. The Soviets made it clear, however, that they would not make payments retroactive to the period before the beginning of the new mandate. At the request of France, the mandate was extended only 3 months, instead of the customary 6 months, so that it be made clear that such renewals should not be considered automatic and to focus attention on the need to develop permanent security arrangements in the region. Otherwise, except for updating references to previous resolutions, the resolution was identical to the one that preceded it. (Resolution 575 of 1985) Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Walters stated that "we believe that UNIFIL makes an important contribution to efforts to bring stability to southern Lebanon and that its disbandment now would be imprudent."

UNIFIL Renewal, July 18. By an identical vote, the Council renewed UNIFIL's mandate with a resolution that was virtually identical to that of April (see above), except that it was for 6 months (Resolution 586). The Soviet Union bitterly criticized

Israel, for “repeated attacks on Lebanese populated areas and defiance of UN resolutions,” and the United States, “which is behind Israel, its strategic ally.” Both Israel and the United States rejected these charges. Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Byrne declared that “the United States has steadfastly worked to support the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Lebanon.” She also pointed out that for now “there appears to be no real alternative to [UNIFIL], which has clearly contributed to efforts to bring stability to southern Lebanon, despite the limitations placed upon it.”

UNSC Presidential Statement and Resolution, September 5. Following the apparently deliberate killing, in separate incidents, of an Irish and three French UNIFIL soldiers, the UNSC released a Presidential statement on September 5 expressing “indignation at such resort to deliberate violence, which places in jeopardy the safety of the members of the Force.” The statement continued that the Council “considers it essential to adopt with all urgency measures aimed at the effective reinforcement of the security of the members of the Force and requests the Secretary-General to undertake necessary steps to that effect.”

Under instructions from the Council, the Secretary-General submitted a report on September 19 that implied that the presence of Israeli troops in southern Lebanon was the prime cause of the problems and dangers facing UNIFIL and concluded that the UNSC would have to consider seriously withdrawing UNIFIL if it were not deployed to the Israeli border (as required by its mandate). The French Representative then called for a Council meeting to debate the report, and meetings were held on September 19, 22, and 23. Arab Representatives heavily criticized Israel during the debate, while the Israelis stated that the Secretary-General’s report was unbalanced. Acknowledging that UNIFIL assisted in keeping the peace in southern Lebanon, they stressed that the Force “cannot be expected to defend Israel” and that the Israeli Government “will do what is necessary to protect the lives of its citizens.”

On September 23 the Council adopted by 14 to 0, with the United States abstaining, a resolution calling for “an end in southern Lebanon to any military presence which is not accepted by the Lebanese authorities.” (Resolution 587) The resolution also asked the Secretary-General “to take any further measures needed to enhance the security of the men of the Force” and to report back to the Council on the application of the resolution. In his explanation of our abstention, Ambassador Walters reiterated strong U.S. support for UNIFIL and condemnation of those re-

sponsible for attacks on the Force. He stressed, however, that “the resolution just voted by this Council will not support” the objectives of obtaining Lebanon’s sovereignty, unity, and independence, or improving the security of UNIFIL. These objectives were being prevented by “the absence of agreement among the parties that would protect their respective interests. . . . Lasting peace and stability . . . can only come through agreed-on security measures . . . not in the power of the Secretary-General to impose. It is neither realistic nor responsible to demand this [of the UNSYG], and doing so will only increase the level of friction and mistrust that has been an obstacle to fulfillment of UNIFIL’s mandate.”

UN Disengagement Observer Force

Continuing the routine procedure of previous years, the Security Council unanimously renewed the 6-month mandate for the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) without debate on the two occasions that the issue came up in 1986. This peacekeeping force operates on the Golan Heights between Israeli and Syrian forces.

UNDOF Renewal, May 29. The Council unanimously adopted a resolution extending the mandate for 6 months. (Resolution 584) The resolution was identical in form and language to the UNDOF resolutions of recent years. Also identical to past practice was a statement delivered after the vote by the President of the Council, which endorsed a comment in the Secretary-General’s latest UNDOF report—a comment regularly included in these reports—calling the situation in the Middle East “potentially dangerous,” despite the calm in the Israeli-Syrian sector, as long as a comprehensive Middle East settlement is not reached.

UNDOF Renewal, November 26. The Security Council followed exactly the same procedure as before (see above) to renew the mandate for another 6 months. (Resolution 590) The text of the resolution did not differ except for updating references from earlier UNDOF renewal resolutions, and the vote was again unanimous.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Israeli Credentials

As in the past several years, there was a challenge at the 41st UNGA to the credentials of Israel. On October 21 the Arab Group, supported by Iran, moved that the routine resolution before the UNGA Plenary that accepted the report of the Credentials Committee be amended by adding the words “except with

regard to the credentials of Israel.” The Icelandic Representative, speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, moved formally under Rule 74 of the General Assembly’s rules of procedure that no action be taken on the Arab Group amendment. (This motion repeated Nordic actions of the previous 4 years on this issue.) Immediately put to a vote, the motion was adopted 77 (U.S.) to 40, with 16 abstentions. Having thus disposed of this challenge, the Assembly accepted the first report of the Credentials Committee without a vote.

Situation in the Middle East

The Assembly debated the annually recurring agenda item titled “The Situation in the Middle East” in four plenary sessions on November 26 and 28, followed by a fifth session on December 4, at which time the three draft resolutions submitted under this topic were adopted. The United States voted against two of them and abstained on one.

The first draft resolution was sponsored by 25 states. It contained a mixture of caustically worded provisions against Israel and in favor of the standard Arab position in the Arab-Israeli dispute. One operative paragraph sharply criticized “the agreements on strategic cooperation between the United States of America and Israel signed on 30 November 1981, and the continued supply of modern arms and materiel to Israel, augmented by substantial economic aid, including the recently concluded Agreement on the Establishment of a Free Trade Area between the two Governments”; specifically, the resolution asserted, the agreements “have encouraged Israel to pursue its aggressive and expansionist policies . . . and would have adverse effects on efforts for the establishment of a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace in the Middle East and would threaten the security of the region.” Other operative paragraphs reaffirmed the Assembly’s support for convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East under UN auspices. Our diplomats lobbied extensively against this draft prior to voting, both in New York and in the capitals of various countries. The text was adopted by a vote of 104 to 19 (U.S.), with 32 abstentions. (Resolution 41/162 A) Joining the United States against the resolution were a number of Western countries and Israel; the abstentions came from various regions.

Just before the above vote, a separate ballot was taken at the request of the United States on the provision that we found most objectionable, i.e., the operative paragraph referring to the agreement between the United States and Israel. The paragraph was

upheld by a vote of 66 to 38 (U.S.), with 41 abstentions. Although the paragraph was retained in the resolution by this vote, there were more negative votes than the previous year. The negative votes and abstentions, which included all countries of the Western group, most Latin American States and several African nations, exceeded the affirmative votes.

The second draft resolution was introduced by 30 states, largely the same as those that sponsored the first text. Concentrating heavily but not exclusively on the situation in the Golan Heights, it contained another set of sharply anti-Israeli strictures. Israel's actions in the Golan area were held to be both illegal and "a continuing threat to international peace and security." Two paragraphs, one preambular and the other in the operative section, reiterated the charge that Israel "is not a peace-loving Member State." Several operative paragraphs called on states and international bodies to cease dealing with Israel. U.S. diplomats lobbied against this highly objectionable draft prior to the Assembly voting, both in New York and in a number of capitals. Nevertheless, the Assembly plenary adopted it by a vote of 90 to 29 (U.S.), with 34 abstentions. (Resolution 41/162 B) This was a relatively low level of support for a General Assembly resolution on an Arab-Israeli subject. The negative votes and abstentions came from the Western States and a spectrum of other governments representing various regions, especially Latin America.

The third draft resolution in this series, this one dealing with Jerusalem, was sponsored by 32 states, essentially the same group that introduced the other two texts. The first operative paragraph reiterated that "Israel's decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction, and administration on the Holy City of Jerusalem is illegal and therefore null and void." The second operative paragraph deplored the transfer by some governments of their diplomatic missions to Jerusalem. This measure was adopted by 141 to 3, with 11 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/162 C) Several Latin American and African States abstained along with the United States.

Ambassador Patricia Byrne, speaking before the vote on December 5, noted that adopting these resolutions does "not contribute positively to efforts to achieve the legitimate needs of the Palestinian people. It only widens the differences among the parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute. . . . What the General Assembly should be doing is to foster the atmosphere necessary for pursuing peace between Israel and its neighbors." On specifics, Ambassador Byrne said that the United States would vote against Resolution 41/168 A because it is "polemical in tone and condemnatory in nature." The paragraph criticizing U.S.-Israeli relations was "particularly unacceptable" and "all members of this body should

carefully consider for themselves the implications of supporting language which attempts to dictate the foreign policy of a Member State . . . ” She noted that “the United States believes it should be self-evident to all members of this body why it is important for the United States to maintain close relations not only with Israel but with the Arab States as well.” Byrne also reiterated U.S. opposition to an international conference on the Middle East, as envisioned in UN resolutions, because it “would set back, rather than advance, the search for a just and lasting peace in the region.”

Ambassador Byrne went on to say that the United States would vote against Resolution 41/168 B on the Golan Heights because its language is unbalanced and harmful. Its declaration that Israel is “not a peace-loving member state” is a violation of “the spirit of Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and runs counter to their intentions.” She added that the United States would abstain on resolution 41/168 C because we believe that the status of Jerusalem “should be determined by means of negotiations among the concerned parties and as part of an overall peace settlement.”

In conclusion, Ambassador Byrne stressed that, while we recognized that there are differences of opinion on the best tactics to achieve peace in the region, the General Assembly “should renounce polemics in favor of peacemaking. We must all try to create the conditions in which the parties can resolve their differences among themselves. Peace in the Middle East is in the interest of all of us.”

Question of Palestine

In plenary meetings between November 20 and 25, the General Assembly considered the agenda item titled “Question of Palestine,” a topic carried over from previous years. On December 2, four resolutions were introduced, the first three by the same 16, mostly non-aligned states, and the last by an identical group minus Sierra Leone. They were all adopted over negative votes by the United States.

The first resolution endorsed the efforts of the General Assembly’s Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, a body that the United States has consistently opposed as serving the partisan political aims of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The resolution was adopted by a vote of 121 to 2 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution

The second resolution in this series dealt mainly with the Secretariat’s Division for Palestinian Rights, another body op-

posed by the United States on grounds of partisanship towards the PLO. This text, expressing appreciation and support for the Division's work, was adopted by a vote of 125 to 3 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. (Resolution 41/43 B)

The third text mandated the Secretariat's Department of Public Information to cooperate with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People in various publicity activities relating to Palestine, including the issuance of material "on Israel's violation of the human rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories." It was adopted by a vote of 134 to 3 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions. (Resolution 41/43 C)

The fourth resolution dealt exclusively with the proposal to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East under UN auspices, endorsing the concept and for the first time asking the Security Council to arrange for a preparatory conference as an initial step toward a full conference. The United States lobbied against this text in New York and in various capitals. The resolution was nevertheless adopted by a vote of 123 to 3 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions. This represented an increase of almost 20 votes in favor of the resolution over the previous year, mainly attributable to the deletion of name-calling references to the United States and Israel, which made the resolution more palatable to a number of delegations. (Resolution 41/43 D)

Speaking before the vote on December 2, Ambassador Herbert Okun said the United States had to vote against Resolutions 41/43 A, B, and C because they endorsed the work of two biased organizations that propagate "partisan views of the Palestinian issue which . . . serve only those who benefit from continuation of the Middle East dispute and from the imposition of even greater suffering on the Palestinian people."

On Resolution 41/43 D, Ambassador Okun stressed that the United States, like most of those who supported an international conference on the Middle East, desired a just and lasting peace in the region. He continued, however, that a conference as envisioned in the resolution "will not allow for a constructive examination of the Middle East question. Nor will such a conference provide a supportive international context for direct negotiations between the parties. Instead, it would inevitably turn into a propaganda exercise which could only heighten tensions and retard the search for peace." Ambassador Okun concluded by saying that the United States "will continue to support those bilateral and international efforts which enhance the possibility of direct negotiations. It will oppose those which would put off the day when the parties to the conflict can sit down together to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of their differences. It is our hope that

all concerned will recognize the need to transcend the limits of this annual debate and devote themselves to the real requirements of a viable and lasting political settlement.”

Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories

As in previous years, the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly was assigned the annually recurring agenda item titled “Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.” Debate took place in 11 sessions of the Special Political Committee between November 13 and November 20, at the close of which seven draft resolutions were approved and forwarded to the plenary with a recommendation that they be adopted. All but the first of these were sponsored by the same group of 12 states, except the fourth resolution, which Egypt did not cosponsor.

The first draft resolution, on the subject of prisoners held by Israel who were “arbitrarily detained and/or imprisoned as a result of their struggle for self-determination,” was sponsored by 28 states. The resolution demanded the immediate release of these prisoners. The draft was approved by 83 to 2 (U.S.), with 29 abstentions.

A draft resolution reaffirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 and condemned Israel’s unwillingness to acknowledge its applicability. The United States requested a separate vote on the operative paragraph that merely affirmed the Convention’s applicability, and voted in favor of the paragraph. It was approved by a vote of 117 (U.S.) to 1, with no abstentions. The draft as a whole was approved by a vote of 113 to 1, with 5 (U.S.) abstentions.

A draft resolution deploring Israeli actions “designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition” of the occupied territories, especially Israel’s settlements policy, was approved by a vote of 115 to 1, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions.

The next draft resolution condemned a large number of alleged policies and practices of Israel in the occupied territories. Citing the Fourth Geneva Convention, the draft declared in its sixth operative paragraph “that Israel’s grave breaches of that Convention are war crimes and an affront to humanity.” A separate vote on the sixth operative paragraph upheld that language by 73 to 18 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. Many Western States joined the United States and Israel in opposing this offensive provision. There was also a separate vote on a paragraph of

this resolution that called upon Israel to reopen a Roman Catholic hospice in east Jerusalem which it had closed for reasons of sanitation. This paragraph was adopted 117 to 2 (U.S.), with no abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then approved 93 to 2 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions.

Another draft resolution once again demanded that Israel rescind its 1980 measures expelling the mayors of Hebron and Nablus and contained a paragraph condemning Israel for "its persistent refusal to comply with the relevant UNSC and UNGA resolutions." This paragraph was adopted by a separate vote of 94 to 2 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions. The resolution as a whole passed 105 to 1, with 15 (U.S.) abstentions.

The sixth draft resolution dealt with the Golan Heights. It declared, *inter alia*, that Israel's measures that "purport to alter the character and legal status of the Syrian Golan Heights are null and void and constitute a flagrant violation of international law." This draft was approved in Committee by 114 to 1, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions.

The final draft resolution condemned alleged Israeli practices and policies against Palestinian students and educational institutions, including what it called "the policy of opening fire on defenseless students, causing many casualties." This paragraph was adopted by a separate vote of 82 to 2 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was adopted by 94 to 2 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions.

These seven draft resolutions were considered by the plenary Assembly on December 3, and were all adopted on that date. The specific votes were as follows:

—The resolution on release of political prisoners was adopted by a vote of 108 to 2 (U.S.), with 34 abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 A)

—The resolution on the Fourth Geneva Convention was adopted by 145 votes to 1, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 B) Immediately before this vote, the United States repeated the request it had made in the Special Political Committee for a separate vote on the provision that affirmed the Convention's applicability to the occupied territories. This provision was again upheld 148 (U.S.) to 1 (Israel), with 1 abstention.

—The resolution on Israel's settlements policy and similar activities was adopted by a vote of 145 to 1 with 5 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 C)

—The resolution condemning a large number of alleged policies and practices of Israel was approved by 114 to 2 (U.S.), with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 D) Immediately before this vote,

a separate vote was again taken on the tendentious sixth operative paragraph (Israel's War Crimes), and the Special Political Committee's earlier endorsement of this language was upheld by 86 votes to 22 (U.S.), with 40 abstentions. The pattern of broad Western opposition to this provision was repeated. The separate vote in the Special Political Committee on the paragraph of the resolution on the closing of the hospice in Jerusalem was not repeated in the General Assembly.

—The resolution on the expulsion of the Palestinian notables passed by a vote of 131 to 1, with 21 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 E) A separate vote was again held on the paragraph criticizing Israel for failure to comply with previous resolutions; it passed by 115 votes to 2 (U.S.), with 34 abstentions.

—The resolution concerning the Golan Heights was adopted by 142 votes to 1, with 11 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 F)

—The resolution condemning alleged oppression of Palestinian students and educational institutions was adopted by a vote of 119 to 2 (U.S.), with 32 abstentions. (Resolution 41/63 G) The paragraph accusing Israel of opening fire on students was again put to a separate vote, passing 102 to 2 (U.S.), with 45 abstentions.

The U.S. Representative, Hugh Montgomery, speaking in the Special Political Committee after the votes there on November 20, explained the U.S. position on the draft resolutions. He stated that the resolutions, as in the past, were one-sided and inflammatory and "can only delay the day when the parties to the conflict sit down together for the direct negotiations necessary for peace. As such, they serve no one's interest but those who believe they benefit by the continued suffering of the Palestinian people." He stressed that the United States had "worked too long and sacrificed too much in the search for a just and lasting peace . . . to support resolutions . . . which make the goal more difficult to achieve."

On specifics, Montgomery stated that the United States had:

—voted against the detention resolution not merely because of its unjustified condemnation of a single party to a dispute, but also because "it implicitly justifies those acts of terrorism which increasingly and tragically claim innocent victims in the region and throughout the world." He made clear, however, that the United States continues to oppose the practice of administrative detention.

—abstained on the resolution on the Fourth Geneva Convention because "it is a prime example of a resolution which serves no purpose but to retard solution of the very problems which it claims to address." He noted, however, that as in the past we had

supported the paragraph of the resolution reaffirming the applicability of the Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

—abstained on the resolution on Israeli settlements because “it diverts efforts into unproductive legal debate and away from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations,” while reiterating that the United States does not favor increased Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

—voted against the resolution on Israeli policies and practices as “a one-sided and polemical resolution which can only inflame an already embittered situation and widen rather than narrow the differences between the parties.”

—abstained on the resolution on the Palestinian notables “because it presents an unbalanced picture by not mentioning factors that contributed to the deportation of the individuals in question.” Montgomery noted, however, that “the United States believes that the deportations were contrary to the Fourth Geneva Convention and that the deportees should be allowed to return.”

—abstained on the Golan Heights resolution because it went beyond Security Council Resolution 497 of 1981, which the United States supports and which “declares the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Golan Heights null and void and without international legal effect.”

—voted against the resolution on Palestinian students because “it condemns indiscriminately . . . without regard to facts or policies” and we must oppose its “inaccurate and inflammatory language which can only undermine genuine efforts to resolve disputes.”

Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States

Oman introduced at the UNGA plenary on October 17 the traditional resolution that encourages cooperation between the United Nations and the Arab League. As in the previous 2 years, the United States voted against the resolution, which passed by 107 to 2 (U.S.). (Resolution 41/5) In a statement after the vote, U.S. Representative Joan Clark stated that the United States had to vote against a resolution that included a paragraph referring to previous resolutions that were contrary to U.S. Government policy in regard to the Middle East.

Armed Israeli Action Against Iraqi Nuclear Installations

On October 29 the UN General Assembly considered in plenary session an agenda item regarding Israel's attack against Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor in June 1981. The item, which had been considered by every session of the General Assembly since 1981, had usually resulted in passage of a resolution condemning Israel and calling for punitive actions by the international community. In addition, the resolutions traditionally contained language referring the matter to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which, in the view of the United States and many other countries, dealt definitively with this question at the 1985 IAEA General Conference through adoption of a resolution which accepted as sufficient Israeli assurances that it will not attack or threaten to attack peaceful nuclear facilities.

The resolution on this item, submitted to the 41st session by Iraq, was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 86-5(U.S.)-55. (Resolution 41/12) However, compared to previous years, more states abstained on the resolution, and, unlike earlier versions, the text did not contain the usual harsh language against Israel, nor did it refer the matter to the IAEA. Results of a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 [61-41(U.S.)-33], alleging that Israel had not yet provided adequate assurances that it would refrain from attacking peaceful nuclear facilities, demonstrated that a substantial number of states considered that the issue had been definitively addressed in the past.

In his statement before the vote, Ambassador Okun expressed the firm opposition of the United States to the resolution, noting that the issue had been exhaustively debated in the UNGA, the UN Security Council, and the IAEA, and that the outcome of those deliberations—in particular, the action taken by the 1985 IAEA General Conference—was completely neglected in the Iraqi resolution. Ambassador Okun went on to suggest that the resolution, in requesting the next session of the UNGA to consider the item, sought to “fan the flames of hostility and debate on this issue, which is completely contrary to the goals and purposes of the United Nations” and that there are “. . . far more productive ways for the General Assembly to use its precious time and resources.”

Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference

On October 16 the United States joined consensus on the traditional UNGA resolution encouraging cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. (Resolution 41/3)

UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

The Special Political Committee adopted 11 resolutions concerning UNRWA on November 4, and all 11 resolutions were also adopted in the plenary on December 3. The votes both in the Committee and in the plenary on these resolutions were similar to those of preceding years. The United States introduced one resolution, voted for four resolutions, and opposed the rest.

The first resolution, sponsored by the United States, concerned assistance to Palestinian refugees. It expressed support for UNRWA, urged all nations to contribute generously to the Agency, and called for extension of UNRWA's mandate for 3 additional years until 30 June 1990. The Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 119 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 (Israel) abstention. It was adopted in the plenary of the General Assembly by a vote of 150 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 (Israel) abstention. (Resolution 41/69A)

A resolution commending the work and extending the mandate of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA and a resolution endorsing assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities, were adopted without a vote both in the Committee and subsequently in the plenary. (Resolutions 41/69B and 41/69C, respectively.) A resolution urging financial support for higher education, including vocational training, for Palestinian refugees was approved in the Committee by a vote of 121 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 (Israel) abstention and in the plenary by 153 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 (Israel) abstention. (Resolution 41/69D)

A resolution which demanded that Israel stop resettling refugees from the Gaza strip was opposed by the United States for its harsh and condemnatory tone toward Israel. The resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote of 117 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 3 abstentions and adopted in the plenary by 146 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 41/69E) A resolution which requested the UNRWA Commissioner General to resume general ration distribution to Palestinian refugees was opposed by the United States because the real need for ration distribution had ended and its financing adversely affected other high priority

UNRWA activities, such as education. The resolution was approved by the Committee by a vote of 98 to 20 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions and subsequently in the plenary by 130 to 20 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 41/69F)

A resolution which rejected any preconditions or restrictions on the right of return of Palestinian refugees to their homes in the occupied territories was opposed by the United States because it was considered to be oversimplistic, one-sided, and polemical in tone. The resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote of 97 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 23 abstentions and later in the plenary by 126 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 25 abstentions. (Resolution 41/69G) A resolution which, *inter alia*, called upon the Secretary-General to take measures to protect and administer Arab property in Israel and to establish a fund for the receipt of income derived from the properties was opposed by the United States because it prejudged issues of refugee repatriation and compensation which the United States believed should be settled through negotiation. The resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote 97 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 24 abstentions and subsequently in the plenary by 124 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 28 abstentions. (Resolution 41/69H)

A resolution concerning the protection of the safety and security and the human and legal rights of refugees in the occupied territories was opposed by the United States because it raised the problem of what kind of effective measures the Secretary-General might take to guarantee refugee safety and rights. The resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote of 95 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 24 abstentions and in the plenary by 121 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 29 abstentions. (Resolution 41/69I) A resolution which called on Israel to refrain from any action leading to the removal and resettlement of refugees from the West Bank was opposed by the United States because of its distorted description of Israeli proposals and its sweeping admonitions against any resettlement. The resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote of 115 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 5 abstentions and later was adopted in the plenary by 145 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 41/69J)

Finally, a resolution which called for the establishment of a proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds" for Palestinian refugees was opposed by the United States as an unreasonable and unworkable approach to the higher education needs of the Palestinian refugees. The resolution was approved in the Committee by a vote of 120 to 2 (U.S., Israel), and subsequently in the plenary by 152 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with no abstentions. (Resolution 41/69K)

Conflict Between Iran and Iraq

Iran and Iraq sent numerous letters to the Security Council during 1986 exchanging charges of attacks on civilian areas, mistreatment of prisoners of war, and the use by Iraq of chemical weapons. The Security Council acted several times on the war, including unanimously adopting resolutions condemning the use of chemical weapons and calling for an end to the war, as well as expressing concern about potential widening of the conflict.

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

Chemical Weapons

The Security Council met on February 20 and 24 to address continuation of the war and particularly charges that Iraq was continuing to use chemical weapons against Iran. On the latter date the Council unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the end of the conflict and specifically deploring, *inter alia*, "the use of chemical weapons contrary to obligations under the 1925 Geneva Protocol." (Resolution 582 of 1986) In his explanation of vote, Ambassador Herbert Okun placed primary responsibility for continuation of the war on Iran, but noted the United States was "also troubled by reports that once again chemical weapons have been employed. We have consistently condemned such use in the past, and we do so in this case. . . . The use of chemical weapons is a serious violation of international law. It threatens the efforts of many decades to ban this kind of warfare, and we call for its immediate end."

On February 25 the United Nations dispatched a medical team to Iran to investigate the charges of Iraqi use of chemical weapons. Based on this investigation, the United Nations issued a report which confirmed that Iraq had used chemical weapons against Iranian military forces. In a covering note to the report, the Secretary-General noted with regret this confirmation and made a plea for a comprehensive settlement of the war. On March 21 the president of the Security Council, on behalf of the Council members, issued a statement strongly condemning "this continued use of chemical weapons, in clear violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which prohibits the use in war of chemical weapons." The statement also condemned prolongation of the conflict, though it noted that "the Government of Iraq has expressed its willingness to heed the call for the immediate cessation of hostilities."

Security Council October Resolution

On October 1 Iraq asked for a formal meeting of the Security Council to address the issue of the war. The Council debated the conflict on October 3, and from October 6 to October 9. Most of the Arab speakers during the debate cited Iraq's expressed willingness to end the war and Iran's refusal to cooperate with international efforts to do so. On October 9 the Council unanimously adopted a resolution expressing its alarm "about the prolongation and intensification of the conflict" and calling for full implementation of its February 24 resolution. It also requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council by November 30 on his efforts to implement the February resolution. (Resolution 588 of 1986).

In his explanation of vote, Ambassador Vernon Walters reiterated that the United States "deplored the terrible suffering created by this senseless conflict" and our concern that "this fighting will spill over into other countries" He stressed that "the United States would view an expansion of the war to neutral third parties as a major threat to our interests." Noting that Iraq has "repeatedly responded positively to the Security Council's appeals," he called on the Iranian leadership to join in working toward "a prompt and peaceful settlement of the war."

On November 26 the Secretary-General issued the report called for in Resolution 588. The report reiterated Iraq's readiness for an immediate cease-fire and Iran's position that it "is not prepared to accept a cease-fire or to sign any agreement with the present Iraqi regime." The report concluded that the positions of the parties "show no degree of coincidence which would provide a basis for the presentation of specific proposals," but the Secretary-General also called upon the Security Council to persevere in its efforts to find a solution to the war and promised to maintain his own contacts toward that end.

In response to the report, the Security Council issued a presidential statement December 22 expressing its "deepening concern over the widening of the conflict through the escalation of attacks on purely civilian targets, on merchant shipping, and oil installations of the littoral states." The statement deplored "the violation of international humanitarian law and other laws of armed conflict." It urged the Secretary-General to continue his efforts for a peaceful solution to the conflict, and called upon the parties to the war to cooperate with him. In a December 24 letter to the Secretariat, Iran criticized adoption of this statement, particularly its ignoring of the Iranian demand that Iraq be held responsible for starting the war.

UNGA CONSIDERATION

In the 37th–40th General Assemblies, an item titled “Consequences of the Prolongation of the Armed Conflict Between Iran and Iraq” was inscribed on the agenda at Iraq’s request. A resolution was adopted under this item in the 37th General Assembly, but the 38th–40th General Assemblies suspended their sessions without addressing the subject. The 40th General Assembly decided to carry over this item to the agenda of the 41st General Assembly. Again, however, the topic was not raised during the Assembly’s regular deliberations. It was decided to keep the item on the agenda for consideration at the 42d Session.

Afghanistan

Following the pattern of previous years, the 41st General Assembly passed by a very large majority a resolution calling for a political solution to the Afghanistan problem, including the complete withdrawal of foreign troops. This was the eighth session of the General Assembly since the December 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan to adopt such a resolution. Introduced by Pakistan and cosponsored by 47 other states, the resolution was adopted on November 5 by a vote of 122 (U.S.) to 20, with 11 abstentions, matching the record number of affirmative votes achieved in 1985. (Resolution 41/33)

The resolution, entitled, “The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security,” was a duplicate of the resolution adopted at the 40th General Assembly. Expressing grave concern “at the continuing foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan . . . and its serious implications for international peace and security,” the resolution once again outlined four major elements for an Afghanistan settlement: (1) withdrawal of foreign troops; (2) restoration of an independent and nonaligned Afghanistan; (3) the right of self-determination for the Afghan people; and (4) the right of Afghan refugees to return with safety and honor.

The resolution also called on the Secretary-General to continue to seek a political solution based on these principles. The UN Secretary-General’s “personal representative” for Afghanistan negotiations, Under Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Diego Cordovez, hosted the seventh round of indirect talks between Pakistan and the Kabul regime in two sessions (May and July–August). Under Secretary Cordovez subsequently visited the region for further consultations with the parties in November.

Ambassador Herbert S. Okun delivered a forceful statement to the General Assembly describing the brutal impact of the Soviet invasion on Afghan society and praising the courage and resolve of the Afghan resistance. Ambassador Okun further stated:

If the Soviet Union wants to demonstrate its interest in a political settlement in Afghanistan, it need only respond to seven General Assembly resolutions which call for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces; it need only present a short timetable at Geneva for a complete troop withdrawal. This is the missing element in the search for an end to 7 years of war and destruction in Afghanistan.

Cambodia

CREDENTIALS AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations began dealing with the Cambodia issue in the wake of Vietnam's invasion of that country in 1978. This year, for the fourth consecutive year, Hanoi chose not to challenge the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea (the coalition government of the Cambodian resistance). In past Assemblies, Vietnam's challenges to the Democratic Kampuchea seat consistently met with overwhelming defeat in the plenary. The report of the Credentials Committee, which accepted Democratic Kampuchea's credentials among others, was adopted by consensus on October 21.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Since the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in late 1978, the General Assembly beginning in 1979 has passed by overwhelming majorities a resolution calling for the total withdrawal of foreign forces, self-determination for the Khmer people, and aid to Khmer refugees. The resolution is introduced each year by members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), comprising Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Singapore. This year, the resolution on the situation in Cambodia (Resolution 41/6) had 60 cosponsors and was adopted on October 21 by the largest majority vote so far: 115 (U.S.) to 21, with 13 abstentions. Following the vote, Barbados, which did not vote, announced that it had intended to cast an affirmative vote.

The resolution reaffirmed resolutions of the previous 7 years and called for their implementation and reiterated the conviction that " . . . the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea, the restoration and preservation of its independence, sovereignty

and territorial integrity, the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny, and the commitment by all states to non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of Kampuchea, are the principal components of any just and lasting resolution of the Kampuchean problem." The resolution also termed the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea, held at UN headquarters in July 1981, "the negotiating framework for a comprehensive political settlement of the Kampuchean problem."

Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters criticized Vietnamese policy vis-a-vis Cambodia. He declared:

After nearly 8 years, Vietnam's intentions for Cambodia have become increasingly plain—Vietnam seeks nothing less than creation of a vassal and colonized state. The Heng Samrin regime which it installed in Phnom Penh could not survive without the 140,000 Vietnamese occupation troops.

Asserting that the Cambodian resistance forces are continuing to grow, Ambassador Walters called on Vietnam to show a genuine willingness to negotiate a settlement, stating:

Surely, the Vietnamese would benefit enormously from a peaceful settlement of the Cambodian conflict. If they are serious, let them begin serious troop withdrawals and seek serious solutions to this grave problem. Until then, the world must judge them by their actions.

Ambassador Walters also urged the U.S.S.R. to assist efforts to reach a settlement. He said:

Let us remember, also, that Vietnam is not the only country which shares responsibility for the Cambodian plight. Vietnam could not continue with its subjugation of this land if it were not for the massive military support received from its Soviet backers. Most of the bombs and bullets the Vietnamese use against the Cambodians are from the Soviet Union. If the Soviet Union were to cut off this military support, Vietnam would be hard-pressed to maintain its occupation, and peace might be possible. We call on Moscow to place sufficient pressure on the Vietnamese to agree to a comprehensive settlement.

South African Policies of Apartheid and Related Issues

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

In 1986 the Security Council met 16 times to consider questions relating to South Africa. It adopted two resolutions on the subject. Furthermore, in the name of the Council, the President issued a statement on the tenth anniversary of the Soweto upris-

ing. One of the resolutions adopted was sponsored by the non-aligned members of the Council (Congo, Ghana, Madagascar, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Arab Emirates) and one by the Security Council's Arms Embargo Committee.

On February 5, at the request of the African Group, the UNSC began deliberations on "the urgent situation in southern Africa." The debate, lasting through February 13, saw 46 speakers address a broad range of issues including the South African domestic situation, Namibia, South African cross-border raids, and other pressures South Africa had exerted against its neighbors and, to a lesser extent, U.S. policy in the region. Responding to harsh criticism of his government, South African Permanent Representative von Schirnding declared it "ironic" that the Council was meeting right after the "far-reaching proposals" made by Prime Minister Botha on January 31. (These proposals were considered by some as an effort to reform a few of the harsher aspects of apartheid, while leaving the basic system intact). He warned that there could be no peace so long as neighboring countries harbored terrorists and declared that South Africa remained prepared to implement UNSC Resolution 435, regarding Namibian independence, if agreement could be reached on Cuban troop withdrawal.

In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Deputy Permanent Representative, Ambassador Herbert S. Okun, noted that the real battle in southern Africa is being waged over representational government, and that the heart of the struggle was the competition between freedom and tyranny. The resolution, sponsored by the NAM members of the Council, was adopted on February 13 by a vote of 13 to 0, with 2 (U.S., UK) abstentions. (Resolution 581)

On June 17, at the request of Angola, the Security Council opened debate on a June 5 raid carried out on the Angolan port city of Namibe. Although Angola alleged that South Africa carried out the raid, the South African Government formally denied any role. The debate closed on June 18, after three sessions during which 25 speakers took the floor. Most of the speakers condemned South Africa for the raid, despite Pretoria's denials. The South African Delegation made no statement.

In his explanation of vote, Ambassador Okun, while welcoming the non-aligned sponsored language in the resolution that called on Member States to "desist from any action that would undermine the independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty of Angola," rejected calls to assist the Angolan Armed Forces. The resolution was vetoed by a vote of 12 to 2 (U.S., United Kingdom) with France abstaining, because it contained language call-

ing for mandatory, selective sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

After 18 months of negotiations, the Security Council's Arms Embargo Committee—on which the United States sits—agreed on the text of a resolution strengthening the extant UN arms embargo against South Africa. The resolution is voluntary in language and does not extend the arms embargo into dual-use areas, such as civilian goods that are potentially usable by the South African military or police. After a short debate on November 28, during which there were only seven speakers, the resolution was adopted by consensus. In his statement for the United States, Ambassador Okun recalled that the United States had maintained an arms embargo against South Africa since 1962, fully 15 years before the Council itself adopted a mandatory arms embargo in UNSC Resolution 418 of November 4, 1977. Ambassador Okun noted that the United States strictly enforced the embargo and had from time to time tightened enforcement of it. (Resolution 591)

South African Policies of Apartheid

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly considered the question of "Policies of Apartheid of the South African Government" in six meetings between November 5 and November 7. Voting on the eight resolutions under deliberation took place on November 10. The issue was dealt with in plenary without prior reference to a main committee. During the debate, 87 delegates took the floor, 14 fewer than in 1985. South Africa was universally criticized for its policies of apartheid and domestic repression. Many emphasized South Africa's violation of human rights and the spreading violence in that country. They also condemned the martial law in place in a number of regions inside South Africa. Many also voiced their strong support for mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa and criticized the U.S. policy of constructive engagement. A few countries commended the United States for passage of the 1986 Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act.

The language of the resolutions was essentially formulated by the UN Special Committee Against Apartheid (SCAA).^{*} The

^{*}The Special Committee Against Apartheid was established in 1962 as the Special Committee on the Policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. The 18 members in 1986 were: Algeria, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukrainian S.S.R. No Western members sit on the Committee.

Chairman of the Special Committee, Nigerian Permanent Representative Joseph Garba, opened the debate, accusing South Africa of "showing contempt for the Eminent Persons Group" ** and of being guilty, "unless proved otherwise," of the death of Mozambique President Samora Machel in a plane crash on October 19.

Ambassador Byrne also rejected calls for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations as "inconsistent with the principles of universality" and termed the inclusion, in certain resolutions, of name-calling directed against the United States "flatly unacceptable." Byrne underscored that reaffirming the legitimacy of the armed struggle and assisting liberation movements contribute to the escalation of strife in an already volatile region. Byrne noted that many of the resolutions single out one or another country for actions committed by many, including a great number who sit on the SCAA. In conclusion, she expressed regret that the United States could vote in favor of only one of the resolutions because of the fact that they "fly in the face of dialogue" and serve more to "erect barriers to communication than to foster it."

The first resolution, entitled "Situation in South Africa and Assistance to Liberation Movements," was introduced by Nigeria (as Chairman of the Special Committee Against Apartheid). There were 37 sponsors, 22 fewer than for the same resolution at the 40th UNGA; most were from the more radical non-aligned states, with some Eastern bloc support (as was the case for the next four resolutions). The resolution called on South Africa to release political prisoners, lift the state of emergency, withdraw from Angola and cease cross-border raids, among other actions. It also affirmed "the view that the occupation of Southern Angola by the racist regime was in large part facilitated by the policies pursued

**The Eminent Persons Group (EPG) was mandated by the Commonwealth Summit in Nassau which, on October 20, 1985, passed a resolution calling on eight countries—the United Kingdom, Canada, India, Australia, the Bahamas, Nigeria, Zambia, and Zimbabwe—to explore ways of decreasing tensions in southern Africa. Former Australian Prime Minister Fraser and former Nigerian President Obasanjo were cochairmen of the EPG. Its efforts collapsed after the May 19 raids carried out by South Africa against Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. In her explanation of vote, Ambassador Byrne noted that the conviction that apartheid should be abolished and a non-racial, democratic and representative government established in South Africa as rapidly as possible "unites more delegations than . . . any other political issue debated in the United Nations." She warned, however, of substituting one tyranny for another, and rejected much of the language both contained in the resolutions under consideration and expressed during the debate. For example, she rejected the imposition of mandatory sanctions as inimical to the interests of Black South Africans and reaffirmed the concept that "governments should remain free to adopt the policies they deem most effective as we all pursue our common goal of leading South Africa towards free and democratic government."

by the U.S. administration in the region, especially its support for the armed criminal bandits of [UNITA] and its policies of constructive engagement and 'linkage'." Finally, it decided that the United Nations would continue the authorization of an adequate financial provision in the regular budget "... to enable the South African liberation movements ... to maintain offices in New York."

U.S. efforts to have apartheid declared an important question, in order to require proponents of retaining anti-U.S. name-calling language in this and the next resolution to obtain a two-thirds majority, failed by a vote of 113 to 20 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. A separate vote to have the specific name-calling removed failed by a vote of 60 to 52 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions. The resolution itself then passed by a vote of 130 to 8 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 A)

The second resolution, entitled "Comprehensive and Mandatory Sanctions Against the Racist Regime of South Africa," had 38 sponsors, nine more than for the same resolution at the 40th UNGA, and was also introduced by Nigeria. It reaffirmed that "apartheid is a threat to international peace and security," phraseology taken from Chapter VII of the UN Charter that implies the right of the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions. The resolution also reaffirmed the legitimacy of the armed struggle and urged the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to "reassess their position [against mandatory sanctions] and facilitate the application of these sanctions by the Security Council." Finally, the resolution called upon UN Member States "to exclude the South African regime from all organizations within the UN system where this has not already been done." Because of its opposition to mandatory sanctions, to name-calling, and to legitimizing the armed struggle, and because of its support for the principle of universality in international organizations, the United States voted against the resolution. A separate vote on whether to retain the hostile name-calling passed by 73 to 50 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. The resolution itself then passed 126 to 16 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 B)

A third resolution, introduced by Sudan, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa" had 41 sponsors, seven fewer than in 1985. The resolution underscored "this increasing collaboration by Israel with the racist regime of South Africa, especially in the economic, military, and nuclear fields." It also requested the Secretary-General "to render, through the Department of Public Information and the Center Against Apartheid of the Secretariat, all possible assistance to the SCAA in disseminating information relating to the collaboration between Israel and South

Africa.” An Israeli effort to delete selective reference to itself was defeated by a vote of 83 to 44 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. The United States voted against this resolution because it unjustly singled out one state when many others also cooperate with South Africa, particularly on trade. The resolution passed by a vote of 102 to 29 (U.S.) with 26 abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 C)

A fourth resolution, introduced by Nigeria, and entitled “Program of Work of the Special Committee Against Apartheid,” was sponsored by 45 delegations, three fewer than in 1985. The resolution commended the work of the Special Committee Against Apartheid, authorized it to continue to organize conferences and undertake other public relations projects opposing apartheid, and made a special allocation of \$375,000 from the UN regular budget of 1987 to cover the cost of these projects. (Note: This sum is \$125,000 less than in 1985.) The United States opposed the resolution both because it commends the work of a committee advocating mandatory sanctions and because it allocated the above sum in a period of fiscal austerity for the United Nations. The resolution passed by a vote of 145 to 2 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 D)

A fifth resolution, entitled “Status of the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sports,” had 46 sponsors, 13 fewer than in 1985, and was introduced by Niger. The resolution appealed “to those states that have not yet done so to sign and ratify or accede to the Convention without further delay.” In the U.S. explanation of vote, Ambassador Byrne noted that we would abstain on the resolution because elements of the Convention urge states to restrict the movement of private individuals. For this to take place, such individuals would have had to violate U.S. law; thus the Convention runs contrary to the extant law of the United States. The resolution was defeated by a vote of 131 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 E)

A sixth resolution, entitled “Oil Embargo Against South Africa,” was introduced by Norway with 31 sponsors. This resolution, supported by Denmark and the moderate members of the non-aligned movement, made its appearance for the first time in the UNGA. It urged the Security Council to enact a mandatory embargo on the supply and shipping of oil to South Africa and called for a penalty against companies and individuals that violate the embargo. Ambassador Byrne, in her explanation of vote, noted that, as regards mandatory sanctions of any kind, the United States opposed “the destruction of businesses that serve the interests of oppressed South Africans.” The resolution passed

by a vote of 136 to 5 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 F)

The seventh resolution, a perennial entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa," introduced by Sweden, was the only apartheid resolution that passed by consensus (including the United States), as it has in previous years. It had 48 sponsors, four more than in 1985. The resolution expressed "appreciation to the governments, organizations, and individuals that have contributed to the Trust Fund and to the voluntary agencies engaged in rendering humanitarian and legal assistance to the victims of apartheid and racial discrimination." The resolution also appealed for increased contributions to the Fund. Ambassador Byrne recalled for the General Assembly that the United States contributes to the Fund "because its goals are commendable." She also noted it was "a pity that the philosophy of this resolution, aimed as it is at assisting the victims of apartheid directly, is not more in evidence in other resolutions." (Resolution 41/35 G)

The last resolution, introduced by Finland and entitled "Concerted International Action for the Elimination of Apartheid," had 26 sponsors (including all the Nordic States), 8 more than the previous year. It demanded that the Government of South Africa take a number of steps to dismantle apartheid, including the release of all political prisoners, lifting the state of emergency, granting full trade union rights, eradicating the bantustan (homeland) structures, and withdrawing its troops from Angola. It also urged the Security Council to adopt "effective mandatory sanctions" against South Africa. In her explanation of vote, Ambassador Byrne explained that the United States would vote against the resolution because it called on the Security Council to adopt mandatory sanctions against South Africa, which the United States opposes for the reasons cited above. The resolution passed by a vote of 149 to 2 (U.S.) with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 41/35 H)

World Sanctions Conference

Pursuant to UNGA Resolution 40/64 C of the 40th General Assembly—which the United States voted against—a "World Conference on Sanctions Against Racist South Africa" was held in Paris June 16–20 in 1986. Since the declared goal of the conference was to work towards the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, the United States, along with Great Britain and West Germany, declined to attend in any official capacity. Most other UN Member States attended. The United States did, nonetheless, agree to the dispatch of a message by the President

of the Security Council to the Conference recalling that the Security Council had condemned apartheid and imposed an arms embargo on South Africa. The United States had inserted the caveat that the message did not "prejudice the individual positions of members of the Security Council on the way the problem is to be resolved." The declaration issued at the end of the Council blamed the United States and the United Kingdom by name for vetoing mandatory sanctions in the Security Council. It also rejected the U.S. policy of constructive engagement and the linking of Cuban troop withdrawal to implementation of UNSC Resolution 435 regarding Namibian independence.

Comorian Island of Mayotte

The question of the Comorian Island of Mayotte has been included in the General Assembly's agenda since 1976. The dispute between France and the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros centers on the status of the island of Mayotte, whose largely Christian population, in referenda in 1974 and 1976, indicated a preference to remain a part of France rather than associate with the other, predominantly Muslim, Comoros Islands, which gained independence in 1975.

At the 41st General Assembly, the Mayotte question was considered in plenary on November 3. There was a moderate, non-contentious debate during which the Foreign Minister of Comoros spoke, as well as Gabon (in its capacity as chairman of the OAU *Ad Hoc* Committee on Mayotte), France, and four other delegations.

The resolution, tabled by a number of African States, closely paralleled that of the 41st UNGA. It reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros over the island of Mayotte, invited France to honor its commitments regarding the island, and urged France to accelerate the process of negotiations with the Government of the Comoros. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 122 to 1, with 22 (U.S.) abstentions, receiving 5 more affirmative votes than in 1985. The United States made no statement. (Resolution 40/31)

Question of Malagasy Islands of Glorieuses, Juan De Nova, Europa, and Bassas Da India

The 34th GA (1979) adopted a resolution on this subject that called upon France to repeal measures infringing upon Madagascar's sovereignty and territorial integrity. At Madagascar's request, the 35th UNGA adopted a resolution which reiterated the previous year's call for France to initiate negotiations with Madagascar. Since 1981 the UNGA has decided each year to include the item on the next session's provisional agenda, but has taken no further action.

The United States voted against the 1979 and 1980 resolutions because they called for France to negotiate reintegration of the islands into Madagascar without considering the French position and because the islands were uninhabited when the French claimed them by the recognized right of discovery.

In 1986, the General Assembly again agreed by consensus resolution to include the same item in the provisional agenda of the 42d UNGA.

Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

On October 23 the General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity" (OAU). The resolution was introduced by Benin and sponsored by nearly all members of the African Group. Only Benin, Byelorussia, and the United Kingdom spoke, each on behalf of his respective geographical grouping. The resolution commended the Secretary-General for his efforts to strengthen cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU, called on Member States to give their maximum support to Africa's Priority Program for Economic Recovery (1986-1990), and called on the international community to assist Africa economically on a long-term basis. (Resolution 41/8)

Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question

Title to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), which the British have held since 1833, has been a matter of protracted dispute. The islands lie 250 miles off the southeastern tip of Argentina which

maintains that it inherited a Spanish claim to them. The 1982 Falklands War, initiated by Argentina against the United Kingdom, exacerbated the dispute.

The British have said that they are willing to discuss the normalization of relations with Argentina but maintain that the question of sovereignty is not negotiable. They firmly insist that the interests of the 1,800 islanders must be taken into account in determining the future of the islands. Argentina claims it is not necessary to declare an end to the 1982 hostilities, since war was never officially declared. Furthermore, the subsequently-elected Alfonsín government has stated publicly that it will use only peaceful means to attempt regaining the islands. Argentina insists that it is prepared to negotiate with the United Kingdom but that sovereignty must be on the agenda. Direct talks that began in July 1984 in Bern broke down after a few hours when the two sides were unable to agree on how to handle the sovereignty question.

In 1986, tensions heightened when Britain and Argentina failed to reach a South Atlantic fisheries agreement. Argentina arranged controversial bilateral fishing agreements with the U.S.S.R. and Bulgaria for rights to fish in an Argentine zone. The United Kingdom retaliated by declaring an overlapping 200-mile exclusive zone around the Falkland Islands, just prior to the UNGA debate.

In the General Assembly, Argentina and the United Kingdom presented their conflicting claims. On November 25, the General Assembly adopted by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 4, with 34 abstentions, a resolution (Resolution 41/40) substantively identical to the 1985 resolution. It regretted the lack of progress in resolving the problem; took into account the *de facto* cessation of hostilities and the intention of the parties not to renew them; and called on both Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations to find "as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute." The United States did not speak in the debate.

Argentina accused the United Kingdom of exploiting the fisheries conservation issue to demonstrate *de facto* sovereignty over the territory. The United Kingdom opposed the resolution, noting that Argentina made its offer to end hostilities formally contingent on negotiations leading to a transfer of sovereignty. The United Kingdom called for talks "without preconditions," labeling the resolution "unbalanced" because it called for negotiations on the question of sovereignty and neglected the issue of self-determination for the islanders.

The Fourth Committee adopted no resolution on the Falklands/Malvinas question but during the plenary debate on October 24 held hearings at which petitioners currently residing on the islands expressed their preference to remain British.

Central America

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

On April 6, 1984, the United States modified its 1946 acceptance of International Court of Justice (ICJ) compulsory jurisdiction to exclude cases arising from Central American issues for a period of 2 years. Three days later, Nicaragua filed an ICJ suit alleging that U.S. mining of Nicaraguan harbors and material support for the Nicaraguan resistance violated UN Charter prohibitions on use or threat of force. Nicaragua ignored the modified U.S. acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction when it filed its suit. The United States contested Nicaragua's claim to have accepted compulsory jurisdiction. It also argued that the court lacked competence to entertain the charges, whether or not it had jurisdiction to do so, because of its lack of institutional capacity to ascertain the facts or to prescribe a remedy. In November 1984, however, the ICJ decided that it did have jurisdiction, although several of its judges disagreed.

On January 18, 1985, the United States announced that, because it viewed the ICJ ruling as erroneous, it would no longer participate in the proceedings. The United States did not appear before the Court to present its arguments on the merits of the case. The United States made available to the Court, however, extensive documentary evidence relating to Nicaragua's aggression against its neighbors. In October, 1985, The United States gave notice that, effective April 7, 1986, it would terminate its 1946 acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction.

On June 27, 1986, the ICJ ruled in favor of Nicaragua. Subsequently, Nicaragua called four Security Council meetings to publicize its case against the United States. On July 1, the UN Security Council heard Nicaragua denounce the appropriation by the U.S. House of Representatives of \$100 million for the Nicaraguan opposition and accused the United States of lack of cooperation with the Contadora peace effort. U.S. Permanent Representative Vernon Walters emphasized lack of ICJ jurisdiction and competence to resolve the crisis in Central America. The United States contrasted its own free and open society with the repressive regimes of those who spoke on Nicaragua's behalf. In all, represent-

atives from 25 countries spoke, both in favor of and against Nicaragua and its internal and external policies, some solely in support of the ICJ, and others on behalf of democracy and peace in Central America.

On July 29, Nicaragua invoked principles of sovereignty, self-determination, and nonintervention to defend respect for international law. The United States stressed Nicaraguan human rights abuses and betrayal of the 1979 revolution. On July 31, the United States vetoed a Nicaraguan-inspired unbalanced draft resolution that blamed the United States for the conflict in Central America. The vote was 11 to 1 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions.

On October 21, at the urgent request of Nicaragua, the Security Council again took up an ICJ-related Nicaraguan complaint. The resolution tabled by Nicaragua on October 27 emphasized respect for the international legal order and peaceful resolution of conflict through "full and immediate compliance" with the ICJ decision. On October 28, it failed 11 to 1 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions.

The Security Council met again on December 10 at the behest of Nicaragua to consider the "worsening situation in Central America." The meeting followed a December 4 Nicaraguan attack on a Honduran military outpost, a December 5 Honduran appeal to Nicaragua to withdraw from Honduras, and consultations between Honduras, Nicaragua, and the UN Secretary-General at the United Nations. Ambassador Walters noted "Nicaragua's latest violation of Honduran territorial integrity" with "well over 1,000 combat troops." Nicaragua alleged that it was a victim of a U.S.-Honduran attack and placed primary blame on the United States. The United States, Honduras, and Nicaragua spoke in the debate. No resolution was tabled.

General Assembly Consideration

Situation in Central America

The General Assembly met on November 17 and 18 to discuss the situation in Central America. The United States spoke in right of reply to Nicaragua, one of 29 speakers in the debate, on November 17. On November 18, Senator Paul Trible, a member of the U.S. Delegation, delivered the U.S. statement, which characterized Central America as "a region of hope" in which democracy is on the march. Even in Nicaragua, said Senator Trible, a civil opposition is "trying to ride the wave of democracy sweeping the rest of Latin America." On November 18, the General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution that noted the resolution adopt-

ed on November 14 by the Organization of American States General Assembly. (Resolution 41/37)

The resolution called for respect of international law by all states, acknowledged the "commendable efforts being made by the Contadora Group and the Support Group with a view to achieving peace in Central America", and reiterated support for the peace efforts of the Member States of the Contadora and Support Groups. The U.S. explanation of vote by Ambassador Walters emphasized the resolution's commitment to "self-determination" as reinforcing the "crucial role of democracy in allowing citizens to choose their leaders through freely-contested, fair elections"; it also affirmed the 21 points in the 1983 Contadora Document of Objectives.

International Court of Justice: Nicaragua

After the Security Council failed to pass its ICJ resolution on October 28, Nicaragua secured the addition of this issue to the General Assembly agenda as an "urgent" item. In the September 3 debate in the UNGA Plenary, only the United States, Nicaragua, and Mexico presented statements. The United States pointed out that the General Assembly has no role in ICJ judgments and that the resolution ignored the real reasons for conflict in Central America, including the Nicaraguan Government's conflict with its own people and with its neighbors. The resolution passed 94 to 3 (U.S.), with 47 abstentions. (Resolution 41/31)

Nicaragua Trade Embargo

The Second Committee and Plenary considered a Nicaraguan sponsored resolution regretting the U.S. trade embargo against Nicaragua. In the Second Committee, Special Advisor Chester E. Norris, Jr. emphasized the U.S. desire to consider the embargo in a "complete and comprehensive manner," resulting in our motion that the issue be moved to the plenary debate on Central America. After the Committee rejected the appeal, the United States had prepared "simple, straightforward amendments" that "did not attempt to undermine the original text."

When the cosponsors led by Mexico added sub-amendments that compromised the U.S. amendments, the United States withdrew its amendments which would have added balance to the text by mentioning national reconciliation and the human rights situation in Nicaragua. Mr. Norris pointed out that "nearly every country in this hall engages in trade measures for political reasons, or has done so in the past, or has expressed a willingness to do so in the future." The United States then walked out in protest

and was not present for the vote: 86 to 1, with 43 abstentions. The plenary vote was 83 to 2 (U.S., Israel), with 44 abstentions. (Resolution 41/164)

In his explanation of vote in the plenary, Ambassador Vernon Walters called the resolution "a direct attack on the United States" and "the ultimate in hypocrisy." The resolution "ignored the reasons the United States decided to invoke a trade embargo against Nicaragua," while reflecting a "double standard", since Nicaragua itself "maintains a trade embargo as an instrument of its current political policy."

Emergency Assistance to El Salvador

A severe earthquake struck El Salvador on October 10, killing approximately 1,000 people, rendering some 150,000 people homeless, and causing damage estimated at several hundred million dollars. At the urgent request of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, the UNGA General Committee added an item on Emergency Assistance to El Salvador, approved by consensus on October 14. It called for appropriate material and financial support from the international community. (Resolution 41/2)

Cyprus

Representatives of the Secretary-General participated in low-level talks in Geneva with Turkish Cypriot representatives on February 26 and 27, and with Greek Cypriot representatives on February 28 and March 1, followed by separate talks with both sides in Nicosia on March 3. On the basis of these and previous discussions, the Secretary-General presented a draft framework agreement to the two parties on March 29. Cypriot President Kyprianou informed the Secretary-General on April 20 that the Greek Cypriot side could not accept the draft framework until there had been prior discussion of such basic issues as withdrawal of Turkish forces and settlers, and international guarantees. He also called for the convening of an international conference or a high level meeting between the leaders of the two Cypriot communities. Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash informed the Secretary-General in letters dated April 21 and 27 that he was prepared to sign the draft framework agreement and was opposed to any new procedural approaches prior to Greek Cypriot acceptance of that agreement. In response to further messages from the Secretary-General, President Kyprianou reiterated his views on the draft

framework on June 10. The positions of the two sides remained the same for the remainder of the year.

U.S. officials met with various Cypriot, Turkish, and Greek officials throughout the year to underline the continuing U.S. determination to promote a peaceful and enduring solution to the Cyprus question and to support the Secretary-General's latest initiative. There was no General Assembly action on Cyprus during the 41st Session.

On June 13 and December 11 the Security Council renewed the mandate of the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), each time for an additional 6 months. (Resolutions 585 and 593 of 1986)

DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL

UN Disarmament Commission

The United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) is a subsidiary body of the General Assembly designated to deliberate arms control and security issues assigned to it by the UNGA. It is composed of all UN Member States and meets annually in New York for 3 or 4 weeks. In contrast to the General Assembly, the UNDC does not vote on resolutions but operates under the consensus principle. The 1986 session of the Commission was held under the chairmanship of Ambassador Henning Wegener of the Federal Republic of Germany from May 5 to May 23, having been shortened by 1 week in response to the United Nations financial crisis. Six substantive agenda items were considered.

Five were carried over from the 1985 session: nuclear/conventional disarmament, reduction of military budgets, South Africa's nuclear capability, the role of the United Nations in disarmament, and curbing the naval arms race; the sixth item, confidence-building measures, was carried over from the 1984 session. The Commission established working groups for three agenda items: reduction of military budgets, South Africa's nuclear capability, and review of the UN role in disarmament. A contact group of the Committee of the Whole dealt with the subject of nuclear and conventional disarmament. The agenda item concerning confidence-building measures was handled in informal consultations by the chairman.

In Working Group I on reduction of military budgets, the United States continued to advocate the submission by all states of complete military data as a step to promote the goals of transparency and comparability which, in turn, would enhance mutual

confidence among participating states. Fundamental differences on the above principles (paragraphs 7 and 8 of the working paper) remained, and the group was unable to reach agreement on a complete set of recommendations.

Working Group II dealt with the UN role in disarmament. Discussions were based on Cameroon's proposals for far-reaching organizational and procedural changes in the UN machinery dealing with disarmament issues. The detailed views of the U.S. Government on this subject were submitted to the UN Secretary-General on 14 May 1985 (A/CN.10/69/ADD.3). In this document, the United States, *inter alia*, emphasized the importance of adherence to the UN Charter, especially Article 2 (4) on the non-use of force, and the need for streamlining UN activities in the field of disarmament. Following discussions in this group, the chairman submitted a paper entitled "Findings, Recommendations, and Proposals" for consideration by the UNDC at its 1987 session.

Debate in Working Group III on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability continued to be deadlocked over the issue of facts versus speculation regarding South Africa's nuclear potential.

Deliberations on "nuclear/conventional disarmament" remained inconclusive, and the United States recommended deletion of this item from the UNDC agenda.

On the subject of "confidence-building measures," the UNDC chairman submitted a draft document containing revised guidelines for appropriate CBM's and transmitted them in the UNDC report to the 41st UNGA.

The controversial item on the "naval arms race" was reintroduced by the 40th UNGA, which had adopted a Swedish resolution requesting the UNDC to consider it in 1986. In 1985 the United States voted against this resolution on the grounds that, *inter alia*, naval armaments cannot be considered for arms control purposes in isolation from other military forces. For the same reasons, the United States opposed inclusion of this issue on the UNDC agenda. While the UNDC cannot overrule UNGA requests, in light of the U.S. position on this issue, no working group was formed. The Commission chairman undertook to conduct consultations under his own authority. The United States did not participate in those consultations.

The report of the UNDC was submitted to the 41st UNGA where a resolution on it (41/86 E) was adopted without a vote. The resolution, *inter alia*, noted that the UNDC had yet to conclude consideration of some items on its agenda. It requested the Commission to continue its work according to its mandate, and to

make every effort to achieve specific recommendations at its next substantive session in 1987. The resolution also requested the UN Secretary-General to transmit to the UNDC the report of the Conference on Disarmament, together with all the official records of the 41st Session of the UNGA relating to disarmament matters, and to render all necessary assistance to the UNDC.

Conference on Disarmament

The Conference on Disarmament (CD), known until 1984 as the Committee on Disarmament, is the principal forum established by the international community for the negotiation of multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements. It has 40 members,* including powers including the five nuclear-weapon states. This body evolved from the smaller Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which met from 1969 to 1978, and the earlier Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC), which existed from 1961 to 1969. The ENDC, in turn, was an outgrowth of a 10-nation committee and of previous, less-formal, consultative groups involving mainly the major powers.

The CD is an autonomous body with its own rules of procedure. It is, however, linked to the United Nations through a personal representative of the Secretary-General who serves as Secretary-General of the Conference. The United Nations also provides administrative support to the Conference through the regular UN budget. The Conference reports annually on its activities to the UN General Assembly, and resolutions adopted by the Assembly frequently request the Conference to consider specific disarmament matters.

The CD meets each year in a two-part session. In 1986, the Conference was in session February 4–April 25 and June 10–August 29. The U.S. Representative to the Conference was Ambassador Donald Lowitz, who headed a delegation of officials drawn from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; the Departments of State, Defense, and Energy; and the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

During its 1986 session, the Conference held 49 formal plenary meetings and 35 informal meetings. The CD's rules of proce-

*The Conference members are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and Zaire.

dures provide that nonmember states may, on request, submit papers and make statements at formal plenary meetings, as well as at meetings of subsidiary bodies of the Conference. Accordingly, during 1986, a number of nonmember states also participated in various Conference activities.

The Conference addressed a wide range of disarmament issues during 1986. Those items receiving the most attention were: prohibition of chemical weapons; outer-space arms control; nuclear test ban; nuclear disarmament; the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters; new weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons; and a comprehensive program of disarmament.

As in the past, the CD formed *ad hoc* committees to deal with some of the specific issues. Four such *ad hoc* committees were re-established from the 1985 session on chemical weapons, radiological weapons, arms control in outer space, and the development of a comprehensive program of disarmament.

Of particular interest during the 1986 session were the continuing and intensive efforts to negotiate a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

The CD's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons continued the work of its 1985 session during a brief session held during January prior to the convening of the 1986 session of the Conference on Disarmament. In February 1986 the Conference decided to reestablish the Chemical Weapons Committee based on a mandate which called on it, *inter alia*, to "continue the full and complete process of negotiating, developing, and working out the convention, except for its final drafting, taking into account all existing proposals and drafts as well as future initiatives with a view to giving the Conference a possibility to achieve an agreement as soon as possible."

In the CD's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons, advances were made in defining which chemicals would be subject to the provisions of a CW treaty. Agreement was reached that the declaration and destruction of CW production facilities would be verified by on-site inspection. In addition, some procedures were outlined for on-site verification of the destruction of CW stockpiles. But many important aspects of these complex issues remain to be worked out. Meanwhile, on a number of key issues (the dec-

laration of CW stockpiles, conversion of CW production facilities, monitoring of the chemical industry, and challenge inspection) major substantive disagreements continued to exist among participants. The U.S. draft treaty, submitted to the CD by Vice President Bush in 1984, remains the most detailed and comprehensive proposal on the table.

The Chairman of the CW Committee held open-ended consultations from November 24 to December 17, 1986. In the CD's final report the Committee recommended that the Committee be reestablished at the outset of the 1987 session.

Pursuant to the November 1985 Summit mandate to accelerate CW negotiations, U.S.-Soviet bilateral discussions continued in 1986 on an intensified basis, complementing the multilateral negotiations in the CD. Four separate sessions of these talks have been held. Also, in accordance with the decision at the 1985 U.S.-Soviet Summit to open a dialogue on ways to prevent the dangerous proliferation of CW, U.S. and Soviet Representatives met twice during 1986 to exchange ideas and address areas of concern. The United States also held informal discussions with other countries to discuss ways to optimize export controls on specific chemicals related to the manufacture of chemical weapons.

OUTER-SPACE ARMS CONTROL

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space was reestablished in April 1986, with a mandate similar to that adopted in 1985.

Between April 25 and August 19, 1986, the *Ad Hoc* Committee met 16 times under the chairmanship of Ambassador Bayart (Mongolia). The United States continued its analysis of the existing legal regime initiated in 1985 and offered to continue reviewing new measures in this area that are verifiable, equitable, and compatible with national security interests. Thus far, the United States has not identified any as appropriate for multilateral negotiations.

RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons was reestablished in 1986 and held 17 meetings during the session. Using the "unitary" approach, i.e., without dividing its work into two separate "tracks," the Committee continued its examination of the two major questions that have been before it for a number of years: the prohibition of radiological weapons in the "traditional" sense, and the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. The program of work was the same as in 1985. On both questions,

major differences over substance and approach continued to exist. The Committee's report recommended the CD reestablish the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons at the beginning of the 1987 session.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF DISARMAMENT

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD) met again during 1986. Despite intensive efforts at 21 meetings, the Committee was unable to resolve the outstanding issues. The Committee agreed to recommend to the CD that work on the elaboration of the CPD be continued in 1987, with the purpose of attempting to complete preparation of a draft CPD during the first part of the 1987 session.

NEGATIVE SECURITY ASSURANCES

The *Ad Hoc* Committee, which had been reestablished each year of the CD since 1979 to consider international arrangements to assure the non-nuclear-weapon states against the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons against them, did not meet in 1986. The CD's final report indicated that the question of the reestablishment of the Committee would be taken up early in the 1987 session.

The five nuclear-weapon states have offered unilateral assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon states, and the U.S. assurance, first offered in 1978, has since been reaffirmed and stands as a reliable statement of U.S. policy. However, the Conference has made little progress on the question of international arrangements.

Other Issues

In addition to the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committees, the CD addressed a number of other issues, including the following.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

As is customary, the agenda item on "nuclear test ban" was considered in plenary. In addition, efforts were made to find a basis to continue work on this item in an *ad hoc* committee of the Conference. While no delegation opposed the reestablishment of such a body, which has not met since 1983, there was no agreement on what its mandate should be; thus a committee was not established.

There were several proposals on the table in this regard. The United States was a cosponsor of a proposal, first put forward in 1984 by a number of Western States (CD/521), that such a committee be established to resume its substantive examination of specific issues relating to a nuclear test ban, including the issues of scope, verification, and compliance. In 1985, the United States also joined other Western States in proposing a detailed program of work for a committee (CD/621), under the mandate proposed in CD/521. Proposals made by others called for immediate negotiation of a nuclear test ban. The United States and others argued that the Conference had not completed the work commenced in the previous *Ad Hoc* Working Group in 1982 and 1983, and that that work should be completed prior to considering changing the focus of the CD's efforts.

The Conference's *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events met twice during 1986, and completed preparation of a report on the technical test that took place under its sponsorship in late 1984 and early 1985. The test was a lengthy exercise of methods to exchange and process on a global basis large amounts of seismic data, as envisioned for monitoring the underground environment under a future test ban. The *Ad Hoc* Group submitted its report on the technical test in August 1986 as document CD/720.

PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR, INCLUDING ALL RELATED MATTERS

This subject was first included on the CD's agenda in 1983, as part of the nuclear disarmament agenda item. In 1984 the CD decided to accord it a separate place on the agenda. A wide range of views was expressed in plenary consideration of this issue. In addition, a number of informal consultations were held to determine how the Conference might best treat this item. While all members agreed upon the importance of the question, issues that had plagued the CD's substantive consideration of this item at the 1983 and 1984 sessions persisted. There was thus no agreement on procedures for structured examination of the issue.

MEMBERSHIP

In 1983 the Conference accepted in principle a limited expansion in its membership, not to exceed four states. A number of nonmember countries have submitted requests for membership as follows: Norway, Finland, Austria, Turkey, Senegal, Bangladesh, Spain, Viet Nam, Ireland, Tunisia, Ecuador, Cameroon, and

Greece. Consultations on expanding CD membership were held in 1984, 1985 and again in 1986, but no decision has been taken.

General Assembly

Although the UN Charter adopted in 1945 gave no immediate priority to disarmament, it envisaged a system of regulation that would ensure "the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources."

The advent of nuclear weapons came only weeks after the signing of the UN Charter, and provided immediate impetus to concepts of arms limitation and disarmament. In fact, the first resolution of the first meeting of the General Assembly (January 24, 1946) was entitled, "The Establishment of a Commission to Deal with the Problems Raised by the Discovery of Atomic Energy," and called upon the Commission to make specific proposals for "the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction."

Since the early years of the United Nations, great-power disagreement has hampered efforts to promote arms control and disarmament within the UN system. However, the United Nations has undertaken continuing efforts to develop organizational machinery that can effectively address disarmament issues.

In mid-October of each year, the First Committee of the General Assembly convenes to consider arms control and disarmament issues. The Committee holds general debates, considers specific aspects of arms control issues on its agenda, adopts resolutions on these issues, and forwards them to the General Assembly for further action.

During its 1986 session, the Committee adopted a total of 72 resolutions and two "decisions," all related in some way to the goal of disarmament. These resolutions addressed such subjects as recognition of established treaty regimes and the need for their universalization, establishment of studies to investigate current disarmament questions, consideration of relevant reports prepared for the General Assembly, adoption of institutional and/or symbolic measures to encourage progress, and identification of specific disarmament goals for the international community.

Examples of the first category are Resolutions 41/50 and 41/58 A. The former concerns the Convention on the Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indis-

criminate Effects; the latter resolution concerns the outcome of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. Both of these resolutions were adopted without a vote.

The First Committee also adopted several resolutions on disarmament studies. These actions included: a study on conventional disarmament, adopted without a vote (Resolution 41/59 C); a comprehensive study on the military use of research and development, adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 137 to 1 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions (Resolution 41/59 H); a study on naval armaments and disarmament, adopted in plenary by a vote of 153 to 1 (U.S.), with 1 abstention (Resolution 41/59 K); an updated report on the "Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures," which was adopted by a General Assembly vote of 138 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions (Resolution 41/86 I); and a study on deterrence, which was adopted without a vote (resolution 41/86 R). U.S. lack of support for such studies is generally a reflection of the U.S. policy of restraining growth in the UN budget. The United States also had substantive objections to certain studies, such as that on naval armaments, which we consider to be based on a faulty premise.

Several resolutions were adopted by the First Committee which were intended to encourage international disarmament measures by focusing attention on the general questions involved, or on the institutional mechanisms available to the world community. These resolutions addressed such issues as: objective information on military matters, adopted by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 0, with 26 abstentions (Resolution 41/59 B); the contribution of UN specialized agencies to disarmament, adopted by a vote of 117 to 16 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions (Resolution 41/59 D); the observance of Disarmament Week, adopted by a vote of 123 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions (Resolution 41/86 D); a review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, adopted without a vote (Resolution 41/59 O); the convening of a Third Special Session on Disarmament of the General Assembly, also adopted without a vote (Resolution 41/60 G); and the convening, under proper conditions, of a World Disarmament Conference, adopted without a vote (Resolution 41/61).

Finally, the First Committee approved several hortatory resolutions emphasizing the obligation of Member States to take concrete measures toward disarmament. Resolution 41/59 F, introduced by China, urged the United States and the Soviet Union "to discharge their special responsibility . . . to negotiate in earnest with a view to reaching early agreement on the drastic reduction

of their nuclear weapons," it was adopted by the General Assembly without a vote. Resolution 41/59 G, also introduced by China, encouraged all states, including the "Member States of the two major military alliances," to take appropriate steps to promote progress in conventional disarmament; it was adopted by the plenary by a vote of 150 (U.S.) to 0, with 2 abstentions. Resolution 41/59 M, introduced by Peru, expressed firm support for efforts by regional groups of states to take concrete steps toward negotiating regional agreements on conventional disarmament; it was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 137 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions.

In addition, the Committee adopted and forwarded to the General Assembly a considerable number of resolutions of greater significance, and these are treated in greater detail in the following sections.

Prevention of Nuclear War

Since 1981 non-aligned countries have proposed resolutions in the General Assembly expressing the urgent need to take steps to prevent nuclear war and calling on the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations to that end.

In previous years, Western countries, led by the Federal Republic of Germany, had tabled draft resolutions containing Western views on preventing nuclear war. However, in the face of opposition from non-aligned countries, these drafts were not put to a vote. In 1986 the Federal Republic of Germany did not introduce a draft on the subject, thus leaving the traditional Argentine resolution, introduced on October 30, as the only one considered by the First Committee on the prevention of nuclear war. Argentina's text was substantially similar to that of previous years. Describing the issue as a matter of the "highest priority," it requested the Conference on Disarmament once again to establish an *ad hoc* committee to negotiate measures designed to prevent nuclear war.

The Argentine resolution was approved in the First Committee on November 12 by a vote of 113 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions, and adopted in the Assembly plenary on December 4 by 134 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. The United States voted against the resolution because of its attempts to arrogate to the First Committee authority reserved to the Conference on Disarmament to decide its own work program, and because the United States

believes it is necessary to prevent all wars, not just nuclear war. (Resolution 41/86 G)

Radiological Weapons

Since 1979 the General Assembly has adopted a resolution every year supporting the negotiation of a convention to ban the development, production, stockpiling, and use of radiological weapons. It was in that year that the United States and the Soviet Union submitted a joint proposal on the major elements of such a treaty to the Conference on Disarmament. These resolutions for the most part had been adopted each year without a vote.

The 1986 version of the resolution on a radiological weapons convention was tabled on October 27 by Cuba, in its capacity as chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during the 1986 session of the Conference on Disarmament, and was cosponsored by Australia, Hungary, Japan, and Sweden. It was largely procedural and essentially similar to its predecessors. The resolution recognized the utility of the work performed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during 1986 and requested the Conference on Disarmament to continue its negotiations toward a convention to ban radiological weapons.

The resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee on November 10, and in the plenary on December 3. Following the Committee's action, Ambassador Lowitz explained that the United States continues to support the negotiation of an effective ban on radiological weapons and is seeking to identify verification measures that would deter potential violators of a convention. At the same time, he continued, the United States continues to believe that the question of additional legal protection against attacks on nuclear facilities should be considered separately from the question of a radiological weapons ban. (Resolution 41/59 A)

Iraq introduced a second resolution on radiological weapons on October 30. Asserting that Israel's 1981 attack on an Iraqi nuclear facility constituted an unprecedented danger to international peace and security, the resolution declared that military attacks against any kind of nuclear installation were "tantamount to the use of radiological weapons" and requested the Conference on Disarmament to reach early agreement on the prohibition of such attacks. The United States voted against this resolution because of its extreme criticism of Israel and because the United States does not accept the premise that a radiological weapons treaty should deal with attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities. The

Iraqi resolution was approved in the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 90 to 3 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution December 3 by a vote of 111 to 3 (U.S.), with 38 abstentions. (Resolution 41/59 I)

Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space

At the 41st General Assembly, four draft resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the subject of outer-space arms control. The draft from the Soviet Union, although it did not call for the creation of a "world space organization" (as did the Soviet text in 1985), did urge the establishment of "relevant machinery" to enhance international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space; it also contained language critical of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. China tabled a draft critical of the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations on outer-space arms control, while Italy presented a resolution offering Western views on the issue. Ultimately, all three of these resolutions were withdrawn, and a fourth resolution, introduced by Egypt and Sri Lanka on behalf of non-aligned countries, was voted upon by the Committee.

Drafted along lines essentially similar to the corresponding text of 1985 (Resolution 40/87), the Egyptian-Sri Lankan resolution once again requested the Conference on Disarmament to establish an *ad hoc* committee at its 1987 session "with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements . . . to prevent an arms race in outer space" (operative paragraph eight). The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 17 by a vote of 130 to 0, with 1 (U.S.) abstention. It was adopted in plenary on December 3 by a vote of 154 to 0, with 1 (U.S.) abstention. (Resolution 41/53)

The United States objected in particular to operative paragraph eight of the resolution and called for a separate vote on it in the First Committee on November 17. The paragraph was approved by a vote of 116 to 1 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. Following the vote, U.S. Representative Donald Lowitz gave the following explanation:

The United States has abstained from voting on Resolution L.24/Rev.1, as it did on Resolution 40/87 in 1985. My delegation voted no in the separate vote on operative paragraph 8, because the United States does not believe that there is a basis for multilateral negotiations on outer-space arms control at this time.

Israeli Nuclear Armament

As it had done in previous General Assemblies, Iraq on October 29 introduced a resolution entitled, "Israeli Nuclear Armament," cosponsored by 19 Arab and Islamic States. Consistent with the text of previous years' resolutions on this subject, the resolution condemned Israel's alleged acquisition of nuclear weapons and requested the Security Council to take urgent and effective measures to ensure that Israel complied with Security Council Resolution 487 (1981), and placed all of its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It reiterated a request to the Security Council to investigate Israel's nuclear activities and the collaboration of other states, parties and institutions in these activities (operative paragraph three), and called on states and organizations to discontinue cooperation with Israel in the nuclear field (paragraph five). It also condemned purported nuclear cooperation between Israel and South Africa (paragraph six). In a new development, the resolution requested the IAEA "to suspend any scientific cooperation with Israel which could contribute to its nuclear capabilities" (paragraph four).

On November 11, the First Committee approved the Iraqi resolution by a vote of 92 to 2 (U.S.), with 42 abstentions, and the Assembly plenary adopted it on December 4 by a vote of 95 to 2 (U.S.), with 56 abstentions. (Resolution 41/93)

The United States objected to the overall thrust of this resolution, and especially its appeal to the IAEA to suspend nuclear cooperation with Israel. On November 11 in the First Committee, separate votes were taken on operative paragraph three, which was approved 89 to 23 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions, on operative paragraph four, which was approved 79 to 27 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions, on operative paragraph five, which was approved 79 to 27 (U.S.), with 20 abstentions, and on operative paragraph six, which was approved by a vote of 81 to 21 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. In a separate vote on operative paragraph four during the December 4 plenary consideration of the resolution, the General Assembly voted to retain this paragraph by a vote of 81 to 37 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions.

Verification and Compliance

The United States has long maintained that arms-control agreements are worthless if signatories do not live up to the obligations that they have undertaken. The United States, therefore,

has placed special emphasis on effective and appropriate verification and compliance provisions in arms-control agreements under negotiation and on ensuring that agreements in force are being complied with fully.

At the 41st General Assembly, Western countries introduced resolutions on both of those issues. Canada introduced a resolution on "Verification in All Its Aspects" in the First Committee on October 30 which was similar to its draft of the previous year (Resolution 40/152 0). In its preambular paragraphs, the resolution noted some general principles of verification, e.g.:

- Disarmament and arms limitation agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification;

- the form and modalities of verification . . . depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope and nature of the agreement;

- Verification techniques should be developed as an objective means of determining compliance with agreements and appropriately taken into account in the course of disarmament negotiations.

In its operative paragraphs, the Canadian resolution noted with appreciation the Secretary-General's report containing the views and suggestions of Member States on verification principles, procedures, and techniques. It also requested the United Nations Disarmament Commission "to consider at its 1987 session . . . verification in all its aspects, including principles, provisions, and techniques to promote the inclusion of adequate verification in arms limitation and disarmament agreements," and to report back to the 42d General Assembly. As in 1985, the resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee (November 13) and by the plenary (December 4). (Resolution 41/86 Q)

On October 30, the United States introduced a resolution on "Compliance with Arms Limitation and Disarmament Agreements," which followed up on a similar resolution it had presented the previous year (Resolution 40/94 L). The resolution began by noting the importance of respecting treaties and other sources of international law, taking note in particular "of the fundamental importance of full implementation and strict observance of agreements on arms limitation and disarmament if individual nations and the international community are to derive enhanced security from them." It stressed that violations of such agreements thus affected the security of parties and others, and that weakening confidence in these agreements diminished their contribution to stability and further disarmament efforts and was therefore a matter of concern to the international community. The operative

paragraphs of the U.S. resolution urged states "to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions" of arms limitation and disarmament agreements to which they were parties and called on all Member States to give serious consideration to the implications of noncompliance. The United States made some amendments in its original proposal in order to accommodate concerns of other Member States. The resolution, as revised, was ultimately cosponsored by 17 nations. In contrast with 1985, when a similar U.S. resolution drew a number of abstentions, both the First Committee and the General Assembly plenary adopted the 1986 compliance resolution without a vote, on November 14 and December 3 respectively. This outcome represented broad international acceptance of the obligation of states to comply with arms-control agreements. (Resolution 41/59 J)

Bilateral Nuclear Arms Negotiations

The General Assembly has passed several resolutions over the years dealing with the U.S.-Soviet negotiations on strategic arms reductions. The resolutions generally have welcomed the conclusion of previous negotiations and urged the two participants to undertake further efforts in this field. At the 41st General Assembly, interest in this issue was heightened in the First Committee due to the just-concluded meeting in Reykjavik between President Reagan and General-Secretary Gorbachev.

As it had done in 1985, Yugoslavia on October 30 tabled a resolution entitled, "Bilateral Nuclear-Arms Negotiations," on behalf of the non-aligned countries. It appealed to the United States and the Soviet Union to pursue their bilateral negotiations "with the greatest resolve" and to keep the General Assembly duly informed. The text also contained some language in its preambular paragraphs which the United States found extraneous and objectionable. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 114 to 0, with 15 (U.S.) abstentions, and in plenary on December 4 by a vote of 140 to 0, with 13 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/89 N)

Following the First Committee vote, Ambassador Lowitz offered the following explanation:

The United States appreciates the call contained in operative paragraph one of this resolution for the United States and the Soviet Union to conduct their bilateral negotiations with the greatest resolve with a view to achieving agreements on concrete and effective measures for halting the nuclear arms race, radical reductions of their nuclear arsenals, nuclear disarmament, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. As far as the United States is con-

cerned, it has put forward a number of proposals aimed at these objectives, most recently by President Reagan at his recent meeting with General-Secretary Gorbachev in Reykjavik. Regrettably, however, this resolution also includes, in its preamble, references to certain clearly unbalanced documents, as well as formulations, that the United States cannot endorse. For this reason, my delegation abstained on the resolution.

The United Kingdom again took the lead in drafting a resolution expressing the Western viewpoint on the bilateral talks. Introduced in the First Committee on October 24, it noted the aims of the talks as agreed to by the United States and the U.S.S.R., and called on them to "spare no effort in seeking the attainment of their agreed objectives." Expressing the "firmest possible encouragement and support for the bilateral negotiations and their successful conclusion," the resolution urged the two governments "to make early progress, in particular in areas where there is common ground." The First Committee approved the U.K. resolution on November 14 by a vote of 57 (U.S.) to 0, with 66 abstentions; it was adopted by the General Assembly plenary on December 4 by a vote of 88 (U.S.) to 0, with 56 abstentions. (Resolution 41/86 A)

Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons

The 41st General Assembly, as in previous years, adopted two resolutions concerning non-use of nuclear weapons.

On October 30 India introduced a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons," which paralleled similar resolutions it has introduced since 1978. As in earlier resolutions, this draft declared that "the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity." It requested "the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations . . . on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances." The resolution also incorporated the text of a proposed convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The United States opposed the resolution on several grounds: the UN Charter provides no basis for such a declaration; it neither prohibits the use of force in self-defense nor outlaws nuclear weapons for defense or deterrence. In many parts of the world, nuclear weapons are a central part of security arrangements that have maintained peace.

On November 12 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 107 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The Gener-

al Assembly plenary adopted the resolution December 3 by a vote of 132 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 41/60 F)

On October 27 the German Democratic Republic introduced a resolution entitled, "Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons and Prevention of Nuclear War." It stated the conviction that the avoidance of nuclear war required the "renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons" and welcomed the declarations made to this effect by two nuclear weapon states. The resolution appealed to those nuclear weapon states which have not yet done so to consider making similar declarations renouncing first-use of nuclear weapons. It also requested the Conference on Disarmament to consider "the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character laying down the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons."

On November 12 the First Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 93 to 19 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. On December 4, the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 118 to 17 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 41/86 B)

Nuclear Freeze

In contrast with 1985, when three proposals on the subject were considered, at the 41st General Assembly only two resolutions were introduced and adopted calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons.

Mexico's resolution, introduced on October 30, was slightly expanded from the texts of previous years. New elements included references to appeals for a nuclear-arms freeze by leaders of the "six-nation initiative" in 1985 and at the summit of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) in 1986, as well as a commendation of the Soviet Union's unilateral testing moratorium. The resolution urged the United States and Soviet Union to undertake an initial 5-year agreement on a nuclear-arms freeze, to be followed by more comprehensive accords which would include other nuclear-weapon states. The initial agreement called for in the resolution would establish a comprehensive ban on testing nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, complete cessation of their manufacture, a prohibition on their further deployment, and the complete cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. Finally, the resolution called upon both the United States and the Soviet Union to submit a report to the 42d General Assembly on the implementation of this resolution.

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee November 11 by a vote of 118 to 12 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The Gener-

al Assembly adopted it on December 3 by a vote of 139 to 12 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 41/60 I)

India also presented its traditional nuclear-weapons freeze resolution, on October 30, calling upon "all nuclear weapon states to agree to a freeze on nuclear weapons, which would provide for a simultaneous total stoppage of any further production of nuclear weapons and a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes."

The First Committee adopted this resolution on November 11, by a vote of 115 to 12 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. On December 3 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 136 to 12 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 41/60 E)

Chemical and Biological Weapons

At its 41st session, the General Assembly adopted four separate resolutions on the subject of chemical and biological weapons. Reflecting widespread concern about reports of the use of chemical weapons, the United States introduced a draft resolution in the First Committee on October 30 that built upon the resolutions it had introduced on the subject the 2 previous years (Resolution 39/165 A and Resolution 40/92 C). After reiterating concern over reports of the use of such weapons, the resolution called for "compliance with existing international obligations regarding prohibitions on chemical and biological weapons and condemned actions that contravened them." The resolution urged the Conference on Disarmament to accelerate negotiations on a "multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition" of chemical weapons and called on all states, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive ban, "to cooperate in efforts to prevent the use of chemical weapons and in efforts to establish facts in cases of reports of such use."

In introducing this resolution, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Donald Lowitz, recalled the large majorities by which the two previous General Assemblies had voted to condemn chemical-weapons use and noted that despite this condemnation, there were new instances during 1986 of such use. Therefore, it was incumbent upon the United Nations to reaffirm the urgent need to stop using chemical weapons and the requirement to observe existing obligations. Ambassador Lowitz also drew attention to the disquieting spread of chemical-weapons capabilities. He stated the hope of the United States that the resolution "will serve as a reproach to those states which have used chemical weapons" and

would encourage other nations to restrict the export of materials capable of being used in such weapons. He also voiced the expectation that passage of the resolution would give impetus to the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

The U.S. draft, which was cosponsored by 27 other states, was approved in the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 108 (U.S.) to 0, with 18 abstentions. The resolution was adopted by the UNGA plenary on December 3 by a vote of 137 (U.S.) to 0, with 14 abstentions, for the first time garnering no opposing votes. The Soviet Union and many of its allies, which had voted against a similar U.S.-sponsored resolution the previous year, voted for it in both the Committee and in plenary for the first time. (Resolution 41/58 C)

Two other resolutions on chemical weapons that urged intensification of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a chemical-weapons ban were adopted. One introduced by the German Democratic Republic represented a veiled attack on the United States: It called upon states to refrain specifically from the production and deployment of "new types" of chemical weapons, an obvious reference to binary weapons. The resolution was approved in the First Committee November 10 by a vote of 83 to 12 (U.S.), with 31 abstentions, and in the plenary on December 3 by a vote of 100 to 11 (U.S.), with 43 abstentions. (Resolution 41/58 B)

A third draft resolution, introduced on October 30 by Canada and Poland, was similar to others adopted by consensus over the past several years. It urged the Conference on Disarmament to intensify negotiations on the final elaboration of a chemical-weapons convention at the earliest possible date, and was adopted without a vote in both the First Committee (November 10) and in the plenary (December 3). (Resolution 41/58 D)

A fourth resolution, dealing with biological weapons and cosponsored by the United States, the Soviet Union, and other states, was introduced by Austria. It commended the work of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC RevCon), which took place in Geneva. The resolution, which also called upon nonadherents to join the Convention, was adopted without a vote in the First Committee (November 11) and in the plenary (December 3). In a statement prior to consensus adoption of the resolution, the United States reiterated its concerns over the effective verification of compliance with the Convention. (Resolution 41/58 A)

Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB)

Four draft resolutions had been introduced at the 40th General Assembly on the question of a nuclear-test-ban; three of these followed up on similar resolutions adopted at the 39th General Assembly. The first resolution, 40/80 A, introduced by Mexico, was similar to Mexican proposals in previous years. It appealed for the establishment within the Conference on Disarmament of a committee to negotiate a nuclear-test-ban treaty and recommended the establishment of working groups on structure and scope and on compliance and verification. The second resolution, 40/80 B, also introduced by Mexico, recommended that parties to the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) consider converting it into a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Hungary introduced Resolution 40/88, which called upon the Conference on Disarmament to proceed promptly to negotiations with a view to elaborating a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests. Finally, Australia and New Zealand introduced a resolution, 40/81, which urged the Conference on Disarmament to establish a committee to begin negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. All of these resolutions were approved by large majorities. In 1986 a total of five resolutions were adopted on the nuclear testing issue. Four of these were similar to those presented at the 40th General Assembly, and Australia introduced a fifth resolution, dealing with notification of nuclear tests.

A resolution entitled, "Cessation of All Nuclear-Test Explosions," similar to Resolution 40/80 A, was introduced in the First Committee by Mexico and Sweden on October 30. Describing a nuclear-test-ban treaty as a matter of the "highest priority," the resolution again called upon the Conference on Disarmament at its 1987 session to establish an *ad hoc* committee for the multilateral negotiation of such a treaty and recommended the creation of CD working groups to deal with the contents and scope of such a treaty, and with compliance and verification. It also called upon the nuclear-weapon-states to observe a moratorium on all nuclear-test explosions. The First Committee adopted this resolution on November 13 by a vote of 110 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions, and the plenary followed suit on December 3 by a vote of 135 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 41/46 A)

On October 30 Mexico introduced a second resolution under the same title as the first one and largely similar to Resolution 40/80 B of 1985. After recalling in its preamble the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as other international calls for

measures to end the nuclear arms race, the resolution recommended that parties to the LTBT “undertake practical steps leading to the convening of a conference” to convert the Treaty into a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 100 to 3 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions, and in the plenary on December 3 by a vote of 127 to 3 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 41/46 B)

A third resolution entitled, “Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 40/88 on the Immediate Cessation and Prohibition of Nuclear-Weapon Tests,” was introduced by Hungary and the Soviet Union on October 27. It urged “all states, and especially all nuclear-weapon states, to exert maximum efforts and exercise political will” to conclude a multilateral treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon tests. To this end, the resolution called on the Conference on Disarmament to proceed to negotiations on all aspects of the matter. In addition, the resolution specifically invited the United States to join the testing moratorium declared by “one nuclear-weapon state” (i.e., the Soviet Union). The draft was approved in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 90 to 3 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions, and in the plenary on December 3 by a vote of 123 to 3 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. (Resolution 41/54)

Australia and New Zealand introduced a draft resolution entitled, “Urgent Need for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty,” on October 30 on behalf of 18 cosponsors. Reaffirming that a ban on all nuclear-test explosions was “a matter of fundamental importance,” the text urged the Conference on Disarmament to “commence practical work on a nuclear-test-ban treaty at the beginning of its 1987 session” and called upon the nuclear weapon states to “agree to appropriate verifiable, interim measures” to help promote the conclusion of such a treaty. In addition, the resolution urged the CD to take steps to establish an international seismic monitoring network to assist in monitoring and verifying compliance with a test-ban treaty, taking into account progress achieved by the Group of Scientific Experts (GSE). The draft was approved in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 117 to 1, with 17 (U.S.) abstentions, and adopted in the plenary on December 3 by a vote of 137 to 1, with 15 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/47)

The fifth resolution on testing, introduced by Australia on October 30 and entitled “Notification of Nuclear Tests,” called upon all states conducting nuclear explosions to provide to the UN Secretary-General details regarding the timing, location, and estimated yield of each explosion, within 1 week of a test. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 107

to 1, with 23 (U.S.) abstentions, and by the General Assembly plenary on December 3 by a vote of 13 to 1, with 22 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/59 N)

In explaining the U.S. abstention on Resolution 41/47 following the First Committee vote, Ambassador Lowitz reiterated the U.S. position on a comprehensive test ban:

The United States remains committed to the ultimate goal of the total elimination of nuclear testing, but only when we do not need to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when we have achieved broad, deep, and verifiable arms reductions, substantially improved verification capabilities, expanded confidence-building measures, and greater balance in conventional forces.

The United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in bilateral discussions at the experts level on the entire scope of issues related to nuclear testing. For our part, we hope that the first fruits of these discussions will lead to the verification improvements we seek to the Threshold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties.

As for the abstention on Resolution 41/59 N, Lowitz explained that the United States was unable to support the text because it had as its stated objective the facilitation of an early conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban. He pointed out, however, that the United States routinely announces information about certain of its nuclear explosions.

Cut-off of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes

On October 30 Canada introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the Production of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes." The resolution was similar to others introduced by Canada in previous years. It considered that the "cessation of production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons . . . would be an important measure in facilitating the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons," as well as "a significant step towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race." It requested the Conference on Disarmament to pursue its consideration of the "adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices."

The United States abstained on this resolution because the United States does not consider it realistic to pursue such negotiations in the near term due to the extreme difficulty of verifying a cutoff in the production of such materials.

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 11 by a vote of 129 to 1, with 6 (U.S. abstentions. On December 3 it was adopted by the General Assembly Plenary by a vote of 148 to 1, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/59 L)

World Disarmament Campaign

The World Disarmament Campaign is a Mexican initiative, stemming from the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that calls for “mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament.” The United States expressed two principal concerns when the campaign was first proposed in 1980. First, we had serious doubts that the Soviet Union and other totalitarian governments would permit any free discussion of international security or disarmament issues. Second, we noted that it was not the function of the United Nations or of governments in democratic societies to “mobilize” public opinion.

In 1982, at the Second Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, the United States joined in a consensus adopting a plan for a World Disarmament Campaign. The campaign would be carried out “in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual, and objective manner.” The United States has made clear its expectation that the campaign would be financed out of existing funds and voluntary contributions, and not through any increase in the UN assessed budget. Pursuant to Resolution 40/151 B of 1985, the First Committee held a fourth pledging conference for the campaign on October 28, 1986, during the 41st UNGA; the United States did not participate.

On October 29 Mexico and Peru introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled “World Disarmament Campaign.” The resolution regretted that many of the states with the largest military expenditures had failed to make financial contributions to the fund. It resolved that there should be a fifth pledging conference for the World Disarmament Campaign at the 42d General Assembly. Finally, it requested that the Secretary-General submit to the 42d General Assembly a report “covering both the implementation of the program of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign by the organizations of the UN system during 1987 and the program of activities contemplated by the system for 1988.”

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 114 to 0, with 9 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 3

by a vote of 144 to 0, with 9 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/60 B)

Bulgaria's resolution on this subject, introduced in the First Committee on October 29, was similar to its draft of previous years. The resolution called upon all states to take into account the "main demands of the mass peace and disarmament movements," and cited as being the most important of these a bilateral moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States and the Soviet Union and "prevention of an arms race in outer space." It directed "the Secretary-General, in implementing the program of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign, to give wider publicity to the work of the General Assembly in the field of disarmament."

Largely because of its polemical language on testing and outer space, the United States voted against the Bulgarian resolution. It was adopted in the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 80 to 3 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 3 by a vote of 114 to 3 (U.S.), with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 41/60 A)

A third initiative, introduced by Czechoslovakia on October 30, was entitled, "International Co-operation for Disarmament." The resolution called upon "all Member States to cultivate and disseminate, particularly in connection with the World Disarmament Campaign the ideas of international co-operation for disarmament." It further appealed to states "that are members of military groupings to promote the gradual mutual limitation of military activities of these groupings, thus creating conditions for their dissolution." Finally, the resolution suggested that funds released by disarming could be used to overcome economic underdevelopment in poor countries.

Because of these and other instances of unacceptable language, the United States voted against this resolution. It was approved by the First Committee on November 12 by a vote of 95 to 19 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. The plenary adopted the resolution on December 4 by 118 to 19 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 41/86 K)

Reduction of Military Budgets

In contrast with previous years, only one resolution was submitted at the 41st General Assembly concerning the reduction of military budgets.

Romania's traditional resolution, introduced on October 30, reaffirmed concern over increasing military expenditures and appealed to all states, pending the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, "to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures with a view to reallocation of the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries." As in previous years, the resolution called on the UN Disarmament Commission to continue its efforts to agree on a set of principles that would guide the actions of states in reaching accords on the reduction of military budgets. It further requested the Disarmament Commission to conclude its work on elaborating these principles at its 1987 session and to report its findings to the 42d General Assembly.

The First Committee approved this draft resolution on November 12 without a vote, and it was similarly adopted by the General Assembly plenary on December 3. (Resolution 41/57)

New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction

"Weapons of mass destruction" have long been defined as nuclear weapons, radiological weapons, chemical and biological weapons, and "any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect."

In 1975 the Soviet Union tabled a draft treaty in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) (now the Conference on Disarmament) to ban new weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, the Soviet Union was also the principal sponsor in the General Assembly of a resolution calling on the CCD to undertake negotiations on this treaty. In subsequent years the Soviet Union and its allies have continued to call for such negotiations in resolutions presented at both the CD and the General Assembly.

The U.S. position, shared by many of its allies, is that for an agreement to be effective and verifiable it must address specific weapons as they emerge, rather than treat unknown weapons in general terms. A treaty as proposed by the Soviet Union would be purely hortatory and would depend solely on good faith, a conceptual approach rejected by the United States and other countries.

On October 30 the Byelorussian S.S.R. introduced a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the Development and Manufacture of New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction and New Systems of Such Weapons." The resolution reaffirmed "the necessity of prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons."

It requested the Conference on Disarmament to keep under review the question of prohibiting the development and manufacture of such weapons with a view to undertaking negotiations. It also urged all States to refrain from any action that could adversely affect efforts to prevent the emergence of these weapons or weapon systems. Finally, the resolution requested the CD to submit a report to the 42d General Assembly for its consideration.

The First Committee approved the Byelorussian resolution on November 10 by a vote of 102 to 1 (U.S.), with 30 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 3 by a vote of 128 to 1 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. (Resolution 41/56)

Negative Security Assurances

Non-nuclear-weapon states have long sought guarantees from the nuclear-weapon states that, in exchange for their renunciation of nuclear arms, the nuclear-weapon states would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. These guarantees have been referred to as "negative security assurances." During the First Special Session on Disarmament in 1978, each of the five nuclear-weapon states, in an effort to meet the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon states, issued a unilateral statement offering some form of negative security assurance. Secretary of State Vance made the following statement on behalf of the President:

The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear-weapon state or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying out or sustaining the attack.

Since 1982 an *ad hoc* committee has addressed the question of negative security assurances at the Conference on Disarmament. It has, however, been unable to reach agreement on effective international arrangements.

The United States is a signatory to Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is intended to provide security assurances by nuclear-weapon states to members of the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone. While pointing out that the U.S. assurances stand as a reliable and valid statement of U.S. policy, the United States has also indicated its willingness to discuss the possibility of developing a single form of negative security assurance that would both safeguard the security requirements of each of the nu-

clear-weapon states and their respective allies, and meet the desires of all non-nuclear-weapon states.

As in previous years, Pakistan and Bulgaria each sponsored resolutions on negative security assurances in the First Committee at the 41st General Assembly. The Pakistani resolution, introduced on October 29 and entitled, "Conclusion of Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons," was essentially along lines similar to its drafts of previous years. It reaffirmed "the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." The resolution appealed to all states, especially the nuclear-weapon states, to demonstrate "political will" to reach agreement on a "common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character." In addition, the Pakistani text recommended that the Conference on Disarmament actively continue negotiations toward reaching such an agreement on negative security assurances.

The United States abstained on Pakistan's resolution, on the grounds that the feasibility of reaching effective international arrangements depended on more than just the political will of states. On November 11 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 126 to 0, with 5 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary on December 3 adopted the resolution by a vote of 149 to 0, with 4 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/52)

Bulgaria's resolution, introduced on October 29, was quite similar to that introduced by Pakistan. It noted that unconditional guarantees of non-first use by all nuclear-weapon states "would be tantamount in practice to banning the use of nuclear weapons against all states, including all non-nuclear-weapon states." The text also requested that the Conference on Disarmament continue its consideration of this subject and that an *ad hoc* committee be reestablished in an effort to conclude an international agreement.

The Bulgarian resolution contained concepts, such as non-first use of nuclear weapons, that are not acceptable to the United States; therefore the United States voted against the resolution. The draft resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 91 to 18 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions. On December 3 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 106 to 18 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. (Resolution 41/51)

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) dates back to the 1950's, and remains today a potentially effective regional approach to nonproliferation.

Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The most significant NWFZ agreement to date is the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which entered into force in 1968 and which, by means of two protocols, provides for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. Protocol I, which is open to adherence by non-Latin American states that administer territory within the over 7.5 million-square-mile area, provides that these states will not store or deploy nuclear weapons within those territories. Protocol II, which is open to adherence by nuclear-weapon states, provides that these states will not contribute to acts involving a violation of the Treaty. The United States signed Protocol I in May 1977, and ratified it in November 1981. The United States signed Protocol II in April 1968, and ratified it in May 1971. This treaty and Additional Protocol I, in particular, have been the subject of a series of UN resolutions urging ratification by all concerned states.

On October 30 Mexico tabled its traditional resolution in the First Committee concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Cosponsored by some 16 Latin American nations, the resolution recognized that there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits derived from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the states that, "de jure" or "de facto," are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties. It recalled that the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States became parties to Additional Protocol I in 1969, 1971, and 1981, respectively. Deploring the fact that France has not yet ratified the Protocol, the resolution once again urged France to do so without delay.

The First Committee approved Mexico's resolution on November 11 by a vote of 126 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 3 by a vote of 145 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions (Resolution 41/45)

African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. Since 1961, resolutions have been introduced in the First Committee calling for the designation of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In 1986 two resolutions were introduced in the First Committee concerning nuclear issues and Africa. The first resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration (on the Denuclearization of Africa)," was

introduced by Benin on October 29. The resolution regretted the inability of the UN Disarmament Commission to reach consensus on the denuclearization of Africa and called upon all states to respect the continent and its surrounding areas as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It expressed "its grave alarm at South Africa's possession and continued development of nuclear-weapon capability" and condemned it for these actions. The resolution demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and appealed "to all states, that have the means to do so, to monitor South Africa's research on, and development and production of nuclear weapons, and to publicize any information in that regard." Finally, it requested the Secretary-General to assist the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to implement its Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The resolution was adopted in First Committee on November 11, by a vote of 126 to 0, with 7 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 3, by a vote of 150 to 0, with 5 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/55 A)

The second resolution, entitled "Nuclear Capability of South Africa," also was introduced by Benin on October 29. The resolution "condemns all forms of nuclear collaboration by any state, corporation, institution, or individual with the racist regime of South Africa, in particular the decision by some Member States to grant licenses to several corporations in their territories to provide equipment and technical and maintenance services for nuclear installations in South Africa." In addition, it specifically mentioned that "certain Western States and Israel" have continued to collaborate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields. It also condemned "the massive build-up of South Africa's military machine, in particular its frenzied acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability for repressive and aggressive purposes and as an instrument of blackmail." Finally, the resolution requested the Security Council to conclude its consideration of ways and means of tightening the arms embargo so as to prohibit all forms of cooperation with South Africa in the nuclear field.

The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 11, by a vote of 117 to 4 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. The plenary adopted the resolution on December 3, by a recorded vote of 139 to 4 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 41/55 B)

Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. As it had done at previous General Assemblies, Egypt introduced its traditional resolution on "Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of the Middle East" in the First Committee on October 29. The resolution invited "the countries concerned to adhere to the

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" (NPT) and called upon all countries of the region to place all their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. It also invited countries of the region, pending establishment of the zone, "not to develop, produce, test, or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or permit the stationing on their territories, or territories under their control, of nuclear weapons or nuclear explosives devices." Finally, the resolution invited the nuclear-weapon states "to refrain from any action that runs counter to both the letter and spirit of this resolution."

The United States has supported this resolution since its first version was introduced in 1974. It was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 11; the General Assembly plenary also adopted it without a vote on December 3. (Resolution 41/48)

South Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone. This traditional Pakistani resolution dates back to 1974. Pakistan's text in 1986, introduced on October 29, was along lines similar to those of previous years. It reaffirmed the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and urged continued efforts toward its establishment. Additionally, the resolution requested states in the region to avoid actions contrary to this objective and called for positive actions by the nuclear-weapon states and the Secretary-General in furtherance of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The United States has traditionally supported this resolution. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 17 by a vote of 90 (U.S.) to 3, with 37 abstentions and by the General Assembly on December 3 by a vote of 107 (U.S.) to 3, with 41 abstentions. (Resolution 41/49)

Indian Ocean Zone of Peace

UNGA Resolution 2832, which contained a Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a "zone of peace," called for the great powers to remove their naval forces and facilities from the Indian Ocean. Subsequent annual resolutions endorsed the 1971 Declaration and established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean* to consider its implementation.

*Its 48 members in 1986 were Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Soma-

Continued

In 1980, the United States, together with other permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime nations, accepted the invitation of littoral and hinterland states of the region to join the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Since that time, we have attempted to point out the anomaly of trying to restrict naval forces in the region while ignoring land-based forces, such as those of the Soviet Union now occupying Afghanistan, a hinterland state of the Indian Ocean. We also have consistently opposed the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean until there were indications that it could be successful. As long as the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan continues and there is no agreement on the basic principles that should govern an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, the United States believes that such a conference would be premature.

During First Committee consideration of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace at the 38th General Assembly, the traditional consensus procedure for dealing with this item was broken when the Eastern countries called for a roll-call vote on two operative paragraphs of the Indian Ocean resolution. The United States then made it clear that it would abstain from participation in the *Ad Hoc* Committee until the consensus procedure was reestablished. Following consultations with members, the committee chairman stated during the July 1984 session that "all delegations have agreed that decisions in matters affecting the Indian Ocean are taken by consensus." On this understanding, the United States took its seat again and has participated in *Ad Hoc* Committee meetings since 1984.

On October 29, Sri Lanka, as chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution which the Committee had adopted by consensus in July and which was much like that of the previous year. After noting that the Committee had been unable to complete preparatory work relating to the convening of a conference, it requested the Committee to complete preparatory work during 1987 on organizational and substantive issues to enable a conference to be convened "at an early date soon thereafter, but not later than 1988." It emphasized that the conference would require the active participation of the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users, and the littoral and hinterland states. The resolution also requested the Committee to seek the necessary harmoniza-

lia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Yemen (Aden), Yemen (Sanaa), Yugoslavia, and Zambia. The United States has made clear from the beginning its reservations about the 1971 terms of reference for the deliberations concerning the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

tion of views on remaining relevant issues. This draft resolution was approved without a vote in the First Committee on November 14, and adopted a similar manner by the Assembly plenary on December 4. (Resolution 41/87)

Nuclear Winter

During 1984, thanks to the publication of several articles on the subject, international attention had focused on the possible climatic effects of nuclear war and, in particular, on the theory that a nuclear exchange could result in a significant cooling of the earth, or "nuclear winter." In response to these concerns, Mexico introduced a draft resolution in the 39th General Assembly on "nuclear winter," which was adopted by a large majority. In accordance with this resolution, the Secretary-General issued a compilation of studies on the climatic effects of nuclear war.

At the 40th General Assembly, Mexico introduced a follow-on resolution to its previous one. Taking note of the studies, it requested the Secretary-General, aided by consultants, "to carry out a study on the climatic and potential physical effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, which will examine, *inter alia*, its socio-economic consequences." The study was to be considered at the 42d session in 1987. The resolution (40/152 G) was adopted over a sole U.S. negative vote.

At the 41st General Assembly, Sweden introduced a follow-up resolution on this subject which regretted the delay in preparing the study because of financial difficulties and postponed the submission target date of the study from 1987 to 1988. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 12 by a vote of 119 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions, and in plenary on December 4 by a vote of 140 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 41/86/H)

In explaining the negative U.S. vote, Ambassador Lowitz said that it did not signify that the United States considers the issue to be unimportant. Rather, the United States believed that studies on the environmental effects of nuclear war should be pursued in a dispassionate manner, and free of political overtones. Lowitz stated that this would be difficult in a study such as that proposed in the resolution. In addition, the United States had misgivings over the financial implications of the study.

Disarmament and Development

The question of a relationship between disarmament and development was first considered at the First Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD-I) in 1978 and has been the subject of General Assembly resolutions in recent years. In 1983, on the initiative of President Mitterrand of France, the Assembly adopted a resolution which placed the issue on the UN Disarmament Commission's 1984 agenda. The 39th General Assembly adopted a resolution, introduced by France, which decided to convene an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development in 1986 and which also established a 54-member Preparatory Committee. Although the United States joined in the consensus adoption of this resolution, it did not participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee when it first met in August 1985, because of skepticism about the value of the proposed conference.

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution that recommended acceptance of a provisional agenda submitted by the Preparatory Committee for the conference and set 1986 as the year for convening the conference in Paris. The United States decided in April 1986 that it would not attend the conference because the United States does not accept the premise that there is necessarily a causal relationship between disarmament and development. Two months later, in response to a request by France, the resumed session of the 40th General Assembly formally deferred the conference until 1987.

At the 41st General Assembly, the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee on October 28 transmitted to the First Committee a draft "decision," which the Bureau recommended be forwarded to the General Assembly for approval. The "decision" recommended that the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development be held in New York from August 24 to September 11, 1987, and that a final session of the Preparatory Committee be held from April 21 to May 1 of that year. The First Committee considered this item on November 14. Prior to this consideration, the U.S. Representative stated the U.S. position as follows:

The U.S. Delegation requests that the record of today's proceedings show that the United States did not participate in the Committee's action on the draft decision regarding the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development. My delegation also takes this opportunity to state that the United States will not participate in the Conference, or in preparatory activities for it. Finally, my government wishes to say that it questions the procedural method by which this matter has been dealt with in the First Committee.

The First Committee approved the "decision" without a vote on November 14. Prior to consideration of this item in the plenary on December 4, the U.S. Representative repeated the statement on the U.S. position. The Assembly adopted the "decision" without a vote (Decision 41/422.)

Comprehensive Program of Disarmament

For the past several years an *ad hoc* committee of the Conference on Disarmament has been negotiating a draft document on a Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD). The 40th General Assembly adopted by consensus the traditional Mexican resolution that urged the Conference to continue its work on the draft during 1986, with a view toward completing the document in time for submission to the 41st General Assembly.

At the 41st UNGA, Mexico introduced on October 30 in the First Committee a draft "decision" by which the CPD agenda item would be kept open "in order to allow the Conference on Disarmament to conclude the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament during the first part of its 1987 session and to submit a complete draft of the programme to the (41st) General Assembly at that time." The First Committee and the plenary adopted this "decision" without a vote on November 10 and December 4, respectively.

In joining the consensus adoption of this "decision" in the First Committee, the U.S. Representative stated U.S. appreciation of the Mexican Representative's acknowledgement that a special session of the 41st General Assembly would not be convened "exclusively for the consideration of this item" and that additional financial obligations would thus be avoided. (Decision 41/421)

Confidence-Building Measures and the CDE

In the wake of the successful conclusion on September 19, 1986, of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe (CDE), four draft resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the Stockholm Conference, confidence-building measures, and conventional disarmament. Ultimately, two of these were merged, and a total of three resolutions were voted on and adopted by the 41st General Assembly.

On October 30 Sweden introduced a largely procedural resolution in the First Committee which welcomed the adoption of the Document of the Stockholm Conference containing confidence-and security-building measures. It considered the Document to represent a contribution to improving security and cooperation in Europe. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 18 and by the plenary on December 4, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 41/86 L)

France and the Federal Republic of Germany introduced a resolution on October 30 entitled, "Confidence-Building and Conventional Disarmament," which also welcomed the outcome of the CDE Conference in Stockholm. On the same day, Poland tabled a resolution which treated these same themes. After considerable informal consultations among the cosponsors and interested parties, the two texts were combined. In the revised version, the resolution stressed "the need for strengthening stability and security at a lower level of forces by the verifiable limitation and reduction of armed forces and of conventional weapons" in Europe. Affirming that increased confidence can promote disarmament, the text welcomed "the concrete, militarily significant, politically binding and verifiable measures" on building confidence and security which were adopted at the conclusion of the CDE Conference in Stockholm. The resolution also invited all states to consider the achievement of further confidence-building measures in Europe.

This revised resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 18 by a vote of 98 (U.S.) to 0, with 22 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted it on December 3 by 129 (U.S.) to 0, with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 41/59 E)

Following the First Committee action, Ambassador Lowitz offered the following explanation of the U.S. position on both this resolution and on the Swedish resolution on the CDE Conference:

The United States is committed to agreement on, and implementation of, confidence-building measures, specifically measures designed to enhance security for all through increased openness and transparency.

Regarding conventional disarmament, I would like to recall the Halifax Statement on Conventional Arms Control, issued on May 30, 1986, at the conclusion of the Halifax Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, at which meeting it was agreed to set up a high-level task force on conventional arms control. In that Statement, the Alliance reaffirmed its objective of "the strengthening of stability and security in the whole of Europe, through increased openness and the establishment of a verifiable, comprehensive and stable balance of conventional forces at lower levels." The United States is committed to this objective.

The 39th General Assembly had adopted by consensus a resolution, tabled by the Federal Republic of Germany, calling on the

UN Disarmament Commission to elaborate guidelines on confidence-building measures. At its 1986 session, the Commission agreed to submit to the 41st General Assembly a paper entitled, "Elaboration of Guidelines for Appropriate Types of Confidence-Building Measures and for the Implementation of Such Measures on a Global or Regional Level." In a followup to its resolution of 1984, the Federal Republic of Germany introduced a resolution on October 29 which took note of the Disarmament Commission's report on this subject. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 130 (U.S.) to 0, with 0 abstentions, and by the plenary on December 3 by a vote of 155 (U.S.) to 0, with 0 abstentions. (Resolution 41/60 C)

Institutional Issues

The 41st General Assembly and its First Committee considered several initiatives of a largely institutional nature. On October 30 Nigeria introduced its traditional resolution on the UN program of disarmament fellowships. An essentially procedural resolution, it approved the modalities for implementing the new disarmament fellows training program as contained in a report from the Secretary-General, thereby expanding the program to include training programs and advising services. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 134 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. It was approved by the General Assembly on December 3 by a vote of 154 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions.

The U.S. Representative explained that the United States had cast its sole negative vote with great regret. Although the United States strongly supports the disarmament fellows program, it could not approve the additional expenditures associated with the implementation of new programs because of their financial implications. (Resolution 41/60 H)

The United Kingdom tabled a resolution on UN disarmament studies on October 28. The draft reaffirmed the value of such studies and invited Member States to comment on how they could be improved. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 10 and by the plenary on December 4, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 41/86 C)

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. The Center was set up in Lome, Togo, on January 1, 1986. In a followup action, Benin introduced a resolu-

tion on October 30 in the Committee which welcomed the creation of the Center and requested the Secretary-General to furnish it with "all necessary support." The text also appealed to states and nongovernmental organizations to make contributions to the Center. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 11 and by the General Assembly on December 3, in both cases by consensus. (Resolution 41/60 D)

In a similar vein, Peru on October 30 introduced a new resolution which called for the setting up of a UN Regional Center for Peace, Disarmament, and Development in Latin America, as of January 1, 1987, in Lima, Peru. The resolution asked the Secretary-General to take the necessary administrative steps to support the functioning of the Center, including the "utilization of the existing UN infrastructure at Lima with a view to the full employment of available resources." It also invited Member States to make voluntary contributions to the Center. The First Committee adopted the Peruvian resolution without a vote on November 13; the General Assembly also approved it without a vote on December 3. (Resolution 41/60 J)

Following the First Committee vote, Ambassador Lowitz explained the United States "continues to have serious concerns about the establishment of new UN institutions away from these headquarters," and that the United States supported the two resolutions because "the two centers will be supported solely by voluntary contributions from Member States and on the basis of existing resources."

Also of an institutional nature was Iraq's resolution, introduced on October 30, which reiterated "the right of all states not members of the Conference on Disarmament to participate in the work of the plenary sessions of the Conference on substantive questions." It was adopted in the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 100 to 0, with 19 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 4 by a vote of 128 to 0, with 18 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/86 J)

As it had done in previous years, Yugoslavia on October 30 tabled a resolution on the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament. Rather than being a merely procedural text designed to take note of the report, the resolution again contained anti-Western rhetoric and urged the Conference to undertake substantive negotiations on various disarmament questions which the United States does not consider appropriate for multilateral negotiation, such as on a nuclear-test ban. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 110 to 3 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on De-

cember 4 by a vote of 133 to 3 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions. (Resolution 41/86 M)

On behalf of a number of Western countries, the Netherlands on October 30 introduced a competing resolution on the same subject. Procedural in nature, the resolution merely took note of the report of the 1986 session of the CD and asked the Conference to submit a report on its work in 1987 to the 42d General Assembly. It was adopted in the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 70 (U.S.) to 0, with 56 abstentions, and in the plenary on December 4 by a vote of 101 (U.S.) to 0, with 50 abstentions. (Resolution 41/86 P)

Another institutional resolution was one introduced by the Federal Republic of Germany on October 30 which took note of the report of the 1986 session of the UN Disarmament Commission and requested the Commission to continue its work in 1987 in accordance with its mandate and "to make every effort to achieve specific recommendations . . . on the outstanding items on its agenda." It was adopted by the First Committee on November 10 and by the plenary on December 4, in both instances without a vote. (Resolution 41/86 E)

ANTARCTICA

In Resolution 38/77 of December 15, 1983, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a study on all aspects of Antarctica, taking into account the Antarctic Treaty system and other relevant factors. He was also to seek the views of Member States and of those conducting scientific research in Antarctica, and to request assistance from other interested states and specialized agencies, as well as from organizations with scientific or technical information on Antarctica. The resulting report, which was submitted to the General Assembly in October 1984, reviewed a range of activities related to Antarctica without making any major recommendations. On December 17, 1984, General Assembly Resolution 39/152 expressed appreciation to the Secretary-General for the study, and placed Antarctica on the provisional agenda of the 40th Session.

Consideration of Antarctica by the General Assembly at its 40th Session led to a regrettable polarization of views on the issue, with non-Antarctica Treaty members pressing for fundamental changes in the Antarctic Treaty system, and treaty parties rejecting the alleged need for significant alterations in the system. Debate in the First Committee resulted in the adoption of

three resolutions by vote for the first time, contrary to the traditional consideration of Antarctica under the rule of consensus. Beyond these, Malaysia and other developing states also proposed the establishment of a UN *ad hoc* committee to consider Antarctic issues, but did not press for a vote on this issue.

Prior to the Antarctica votes at the 40th Session, Australia announced on behalf of the United States and the other Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, that they viewed the breaking of consensus on this matter with regret because consensus had formed the basis for past cooperation by the parties with nonmember states and with the United Nations. Since the consultative parties were not prepared to accept attempts to undermine the Antarctic Treaty system, (which remains open for accession by all nations), the parties declared they would not participate in voting on Antarctica resolutions in either the First Committee or the General Assembly plenary until consensus was restored, the only realistic basis for UN consideration of the matter. Australia further stated on behalf of the parties that they would suspend their cooperation with the United Nations on Antarctic matters until consensus was achieved again. This course of action continued in the 41st Session.

The solidarity of countries supporting this position was maintained at the 1986 session, although some Antarctic Treaty countries supported the resolution that called for the exclusion of South Africa from the Antarctic Treaty.

Three resolutions were adopted by the First Committee on November 19 and by the General Assembly plenary on December 4. This first resolution, introduced by Malaysia, requested the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to keep the Secretary-General fully informed on all aspects of Antarctic issues, so that the United Nations could serve as a central repository for all such information. It also asked the Secretary-General to provide an update to his report at the 42d Session. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee by a vote of 76 to 0, with 9 abstentions, and 38 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. It was adopted by the General Assembly plenary by 94 to 0, with 12 abstentions, and 42 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. (Resolution 41/88 A)

The second resolution, submitted by Malaysia, stated that exploitation of the resources of Antarctica should ensure the maintenance of international peace and security, the protection of the Antarctic environment, the nonappropriation and conservation of said resources, the international management of commercial exploitation, and the equitable distribution of the benefits of such exploitation. It also called upon Treaty members to impose a moratorium on the mineral regime discussions until all members of

the international community can participate. The First Committee adopted this resolution by a vote of 76 to 0, with 10 abstentions, and 38 (U.S) not participating in the vote. The Assembly plenary adopted this resolution by a vote of 96 to 0, with 12 abstentions, and 43 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. (Resolution 41/88 B)

The third resolution, submitted by Malaysia, called on the Consultative Parties to exclude "the racist apartheid regime of South Africa," also a Consultative Party, from their meetings at the earliest possible date, invited the Parties to inform the Secretary-General of its actions in this regard. The Secretary-General also was requested to report on this matter to the next session. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee by a vote of 99 to 1, with 5 abstentions, and 21 (U.S.) not participating in the vote, and in the Assembly plenary by a vote of 119 to 0, with 8 abstentions, and 25 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. (Resolution 41/88 C)

In adopting these resolutions, the General Assembly also placed the question of Antarctica on the provisional agenda for its 42d Session.

South Atlantic Zone of Peace

On October 21 Brazil and a number of African and Latin American cosponsors introduced a resolution in the General Assembly calling for the declaration of a "Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic," to be established "in the region situated between Africa and South America." The text called upon all states, "in particular the militarily significant ones," to respect the zone, "especially through the reduction and eventual elimination of their military presence there, the non-introduction of nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction, and the non-extension into the region of rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it." The resolution requested the Secretary-General to report to the 42d General Assembly on the situation in the South Atlantic, and on the implementation of the declaration. It also affirmed that the elimination of apartheid and the independence of Namibia were essential for peace and security in the South Atlantic region and urged the implementation of all UN resolutions dealing with apartheid.

The South Atlantic resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on October 27 by a vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 41/11)

In explaining the negative U.S. vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Noel L. Gross cited several serious defects in the resolution from the U.S. viewpoint:

The resolution inadequately defines the waters that would be covered and specifically excludes the littoral and hinterland states of the South Atlantic region from the zone. In addition, the resolution attempts to create an internationally recognized zone of peace through the adoption of a General Assembly resolution, rather than as the result of multilateral negotiations.

The resolution continues to imply that restrictions should be placed on naval access to and activity in the South Atlantic Ocean. Such restrictions would be inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation on the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters.

OUTER SPACE

The 53-member Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, and its Legal Subcommittee all met during 1986. COPUOS was established by the UN General Assembly in 1958. It was proposed by the United States and 19 other nations to promote international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. For over 20 years, COPUOS worked actively and successfully in the exchange of scientific information and negotiated the four widely accepted UN conventions, including the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, that form the basis of international space law. However, in recent years, the scientific and legal work of the Committee has seriously deteriorated. Debates have become increasingly influenced by political factors and there has been a tendency to involve the Committee in disarmament and other matters which the United States and other Western States felt were inconsistent with the Committee's mandate and with the consensus procedure that governs its work. However, at the 39th and 40th Sessions of the General Assembly, the United States, in concert with other Western States, succeeded in checking that decline, at least for the present.

Scientific and Technical Subcommittee

At the February 1986 session of the scientific and Technical Subcommittee the United States jointly sponsored a working paper with a number of Western States proposing the addition of two new items to the agenda: planetary exploration and astronomy. That proposal was intended, in part, to arrest what the United States and other Western States regarded as a serious deterioration in the scientific work of the Subcommittee. After ex-

tensive talks with other Member States, the Subcommittee agreed, by consensus, to add the two new items. At the same time, the Subcommittee rejected an Eastern proposal to add new items focused largely on the disarmament position of the U.S.S.R.

Legal Subcommittee

The Legal Subcommittee held its 24th Session in Geneva in March 1986. The agenda included matters relating to the definition and delimitation of outer space and to the character and utilization of the geostationary orbit, including consideration of ways and means to ensure the rational and equitable use of one geostationary orbit, the elaboration of draft principles regarding the use of nuclear power sources in space, and the legal implications of remote sensing of the earth from outer space, with the aim of finalizing a draft set of principles. Separate working groups considered each of the agenda items. The Subcommittee reached no conclusions regarding the nuclear power sources or the definition and delimitation of outer space and the character and utilization of the geostationary orbit.

On the matter of remote sensing principles, the Subcommittee made substantial progress. The Legal Subcommittee began considering these principles in the early 1970's. Recently, the debate had reached an impasse on such fundamental issues as data dissemination, and the responsibility of states in governing remote sensing activities of private companies. In 1985 Austria submitted a compromise text that resolved those differences in a way that was acceptable to the United States and the Western allies. In 1986, despite efforts by the Soviet Union to introduce changes, the Subcommittee accepted, by consensus, the Austrian text. The principles were forwarded to COPUOS for consideration.

Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

COPUOS held its 29th plenary session in June 1986 in New York. The United States and the Western Allies continued to press for adoption of measures that they introduced at the 28th Session on revitalizing the work of COPUOS and its subcommittees. The Committee agreed to include on the agenda of the 1987 Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, items concerning space life-science research, astronomy, and planetary sciences. The Latin American group proposed the establishment of a working group of the whole at the 1987 meeting of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee to evaluate the implementation of the Unispace 1982 recommendations, and to consider steps that would

make the work of the Secretariat more efficient. This proposal, which was similar to the one offered by the West in 1985, was accepted. COPUOS endorsed, by consensus, the principles on remote sensing proposed by Austria and recommended by the Legal Subcommittee, and forwarded the text to the 41st Session of the General Assembly.

General Assembly

On December 3 the General Assembly plenary, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, adopted without a vote an omnibus resolution dealing with "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space" (Resolution 41/64). The same day the General Assembly also adopted by consensus Resolution 41/65 entitled, "Principles Relating to Remote Sensing of the Earth from Outer Space."

Pursuant to Article X of the Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, which provides that they be reviewed 10 years following entry into force, the General Assembly considered the question of whether the Convention requires revision. The Assembly noted that the Convention is working satisfactorily and urged states that have yet to do so to give urgent consideration to becoming parties to the Convention. U.S. views on the Convention and on the need for its broader application were summarized on November 25 by U.S. Alternate Representative Joan Clark:

While the United States is convinced that the Registration Convention does not require revision, there is a timely and important step the General Assembly can take with Item 137, one which we strongly urge that it take, that is to encourage the broad application of the law by urging all Member States, particularly those conducting space activities, to become parties to the Convention. Right now, Mr. Chairman, despite a tremendous increase in recent years in national and international activities in space, only 35 states have ratified the Registration Convention; less than 50 percent of the members of COPUOS have ratified it. Only one intergovernmental organization of the several conducting space activities is registering space objects as envisaged by the Convention. We consider this an unsatisfactory situation . . .

The completion of the principles on remote sensing is the culmination of over ten years of work in COPUOS. It also represents a useful step forward in rejecting radical proposals such as prior consent of a sensed state, which could discourage or bar civilian—especially private sector—activities in this field. The principles are modeled on the policies and practices instituted years ago by the United States. This encourages the public, availability and free flow of data, and promotes opportunities for international participation in national remote sensing programs, as the United

States and other Western States have long urged. In joining consensus on Resolution 41/65 in the Special Political Committee on November 28, U.S. Representative William J. Lowell, outlined the U.S. view:

Mr. Chairman, as all delegations are aware and as was emphasized throughout their negotiation, under the Charter of the United Nations, these principles can be only recommendatory in character; they cannot, in and of themselves, possess legal force. Nor, in our view, would the embodiment of these principles in a new legal instrument be necessary or desirable. Nevertheless, these principles constitute a significant statement of the views of the international community on a matter of importance to the future of the peaceful use and exploration of outer space. They are entirely compatible with relevant U.S. laws and policies, and we look forward to other states being guided by them in formulating and carrying out their own programs in this area, whether directly or through persons or entities subject to their jurisdiction.

Despite these relatively useful advances in COPUOS, there are other issues which have remained intractable. One is the unwillingness by many members to discuss ways of streamlining COPUOS to make it more efficient and effective. Another problem is the continuing tendency by some Member States to use COPUOS meetings to introduce disarmament and other extraneous political issues for propaganda reasons. On balance, the West has been only partially successful in enlisting the support of other Member States in the process of revitalizing COPUOS and its subcommittees.

LAW OF THE SEA

The Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (LOS) was convened in 1972 and completed negotiations on an LOS Treaty at its 11th and final session in the spring of 1982.

After a searching review of the draft treaty and of U.S. participation in the LOS negotiations, the administration decided to participate in the final round of negotiations and attempt to protect U.S. interests by seeking amendments to the seabed-mining section of the Draft Convention, which the United States believed to be fundamentally flawed. The United States was unable to obtain essential changes and therefore called for a vote on the Treaty. The vote was 130 to 4 (U.S., Turkey, Israel, and Venezuela), with 17 abstentions (principally a combination of EC countries and the Eastern European countries). The President subsequently announced on July 9, 1982, that the United States would not sign the Treaty, and it was later joined in this view by two

other major seabed-mining nations—the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The General Assembly adopted resolutions at its 37th, 38th, 39th, and 40th Sessions that welcomed the adoption of the LOS Convention, called on all states to sign and ratify the Convention, and approved financing of the LOS Preparatory Commission from the regular UN budget. Only the United States and Turkey opposed the resolutions. On November 5, 1986, the 41st General Assembly again endorsed the LOS Convention and approved funds for the Preparatory Committee from the regular UN budget by a vote of 145 to 2 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 41/34)

In an explanation of the vote, U.S. Representative Noel L. Gross stated in the Assembly plenary on November 5:

... again my delegation reluctantly has had to cast a negative vote on a resolution concerning the Law of the Sea. The United States, as we have stated in the past, views the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea as a major accomplishment in the development of international law relating to the oceans. Unfortunately, the convention contains one part, Part XI, that runs contrary to U.S. policy and to that of others who share our views concerning the future development of resources on the bottom of the deep seabed. Therefore, the United States has not signed the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

One of the reasons the United States is opposed to this resolution is that it continues funding from the general budget of the United Nations for the preparatory commission on the international seabed authority and the international tribunal for the Law of the Sea. As we have noted in the past, the costs of the preparatory commission should be borne by nations that are party to the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. The preparatory commission was created by a treaty separate from the UN Charter. Therefore, its costs cannot be assessed against all UN members as part of the UN budget, as they do not represent legitimate "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of Article 17(2) of the UN Charter. We remain opposed to such improper assessment and are determined to resist such abuses of the UN budget and the UN Charter. Therefore, the United States will continue to withhold its *pro rata* share of the UN annual assessment from the regular budget that pertains to the funding of the preparatory commission or is earmarked to support the implementation of Part XI of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The U.S. position on the legality of exploration and exploitation of deep seabed resources under international law is well known. As we have stated many times, the United States and its nationals, like other states and their nationals, have the legal right to explore and exploit deep seabed resources. Under international law such activities are a lawful exercise of high seas freedoms. The United States and its nationals intend to exercise these rights with reasonable regard to the interests of the other states in the exercise of high seas freedoms. These rights, which the United States and its nationals have under international law, would not be abridged or diminished should the Convention eventually enter into force.

Having said this, I wish to emphasize the U.S. view that the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea has many positive aspects. The United States will continue to cooperate with the international community to ensure that the important principles enshrined in parts of the Convention, other than Part XI, are widely respected.

GENERAL POLITICAL PROBLEMS

Membership

There were no applications for membership in the United Nations in 1986.

Question of Peacekeeping

PEACEKEEPING GUIDELINES

In 1965, the General Assembly established the 33-member Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Peacekeeping Committee) to make recommendations concerning the financial situation.*

The Peacekeeping Committee did not meet during 1986.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The General Assembly's Special Political Committee considered the question of peacekeeping in three meetings, October 15-17.

On October 16, U.S. Representative Joan Clark told the Special Political Committee that the United States prepared to acquiesce in the continuation of the mandate of the Peacekeeping Committee if that was the clear wish of the other members, although past experience did not provide for much optimism that the Committee would achieve great progress in the future. She said that prospects for progress on questions before the Peacekeeping Committee were brighter in other UN forums and the automatic reinscription of the item on next year's UN agenda would not serve the best interests of this item.

On October 16, the Chairman of the Special Political Committee presented for consideration a draft resolution, worked out in private consultations, which renewed the mandate of the Peacekeeping Committee and called for the inclusion of a "Comprehen-

*Members in 1986 were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S., Venezuela and Yugoslavia. Ever since then the Peacekeeping Committee has been responsible for carrying out a comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations on conceptual and practical levels. The Committee's main objectives are to draft guidelines for future peacekeeping operations, to make recommendations concerning the financial situation, and to examine the question of practical measures to improve the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations.

sive Review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects" on the provisional agenda of the 42d Session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote by the Special Political Committee on October 17. On December 3, the General Assembly adopted the draft in the same manner. (Resolution 41/67)

Efforts Toward Strengthening the United Nations

CHARTER COMMITTEE

The Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Organization (Charter Committee) held its 11th Session in New York, April 7–May 2. The Charter Committee operated through a working group that met in closed meetings and continued to consider the maintenance of international peace and security, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the rationalization of UN procedures. The Charter Committee reported on its 1986 session to the 41st General Assembly via the Sixth Committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In seven meetings, October 13–21, and in two meetings, November 18 and 19, the Sixth Committee considered the report of the Charter Committee.

In the Sixth Committee on October 16, the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, set forth the U.S. position that the Charter Committee should either be disbanded or governments should stop sapping its *raison d'être* by duplicating its work in other UN fora. He said that matters could not be rationally allowed to continue as they had in recent years. If the Committee's work was to be taken seriously, it needed to focus on relatively modest proposals on which agreement ought to be possible, not grandiose propositions which could not possibly garner general support. To this end, the United States supported work on the France–United Kingdom working paper on the rationalization of UN procedures and the working paper on the maintenance of peace and security sponsored by Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, and Spain. Progress on this proposal, he said, should not be held hostage to progress on other proposals. Although the United States still entertained doubts over the utility of the Romanian proposal for a permanent commission on good offices, mediation, and conciliation, the United States was pre-

pared to reconsider its position if the idea was broadly supported. Otherwise, it should be shelved.

On November 18, the Philippines introduced a draft resolution, sponsored by 30 states, that was adopted by the Sixth Committee, as orally amended, without a vote on November 19. On December 3, the General Assembly adopted the resolution in the same manner. The resolution requested that during its 1987 session the Charter Committee devote more time to the question of the maintenance of international peace and security, in particular, the role of the Security Council, and continue its work on the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between states. This should include further consideration of the proposal by Romania, Nigeria, and the Philippines, for the creation of a permanent commission on good offices, mediation, and conciliation. The resolution also requested the Secretary-General to continue the preparation of a draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes. (Resolution 41/83)

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION (COI)

The Committee on Information (COI), a standing committee of the General Assembly, is mandated to oversee UN public information activities, including those of the Department of Public Information (DPI), and to coordinate information activities of UN specialized agencies. The COI held its organizational session March 17 and its eighth substantive session June 23–July 7, 1986.

In the substantive session, the principal point of contention was, as in the 2 previous years, the refusal of the G-77 to accept a definition of a New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) as an “evolving and continuous process.” For the first time, the 14 Western nations presented a set of recommendations on the work of the DPI in opposition to the recommendations of the G-77. After unsuccessful negotiation to resolve differences between the two, the G-77 arbitrarily decreed that the vote should be on the recommendations it originally tabled. The vote was 41 to 11 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. This was the second consecutive year in which the Committee resorted to voting because of failure to achieve consensus.

The Special Political Committee (SPC) of the 41st UN General Assembly considered the COI's recommendations November 5–12 and November 28 under agenda item 74, “Questions Relating to Information.” During this period, an informal working group of

the COI negotiated a substitute omnibus information resolution on information issues.

On November 28, the Turkish Delegate, in his capacity as chairman of the working group, submitted the new omnibus information resolution for adoption by the SPC. The vote was 117 to 1 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. A resolution submitted by Yugoslavia on behalf of the G-77 commending the work of UNESCO on information and communication matters was adopted by a vote of 114 to 2 (U.S., U.K.) with 7 abstentions. A Mongolian resolution commemorating the 40th anniversary of UNESCO was adopted 105 to 10 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. Two resolutions were adopted without a vote: a resolution introduced by Yugoslavia proposing the admission of Malta to the COI, and a resolution submitted by Canada commending the work of the World Federation of UN Associations.

In the Plenary Session of the General Assembly, the votes on these resolutions were: the omnibus information resolution, 148 to 1 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions (Resolution 41/68 A); the resolution commending UNESCO on information and communications issues, 143 to 2 (U.S., U.K.), with 7 abstentions (Resolution 41/68 B); and the resolution on UNESCO's 40th anniversary, 105 to 10 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions (Resolution 41/68 E). The resolutions on Malta (Resolution 41/68/C) and the UN Associations (Resolution 41/68 D) were adopted by consensus.

In its explanation of vote on the omnibus resolution in the SPC, the United States conceded that progress had been made by the G-77's acceptance of the definition of a NWICO as an "evolving and continuous process" but objected to retention of wording in the resolution calling for cooperation in the establishment of a NWICO. The United States, which has repeatedly called for budgetary restraint, was also unable to support calls for new programs or expansion of existing ones. The persistence in COI resolutions of two highly selective political recommendations on Palestine and Namibia was another factor in the U.S. decision to vote against the resolution. These recommendations, the United States maintained, had no place in a report on communication matters, especially since they had already been addressed in the General Assembly.

The United States has long been critical of certain aspects of the work of the DPI, particularly the lack of objectivity in the materials it disseminates. In April, the General Accounting Office (GAO), responding to a request by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), published a report evaluating the DPI materials and scripts of its radio programs. The purpose of the report, entitled "United Nations: Analysis of Selected Media Products Shows Half Oppose

Key U.S. Interests" (GAO/NSIAD-86-98), was to determine whether the materials (1) supported or opposed political positions taken by the United States, and (2) fairly and objectively discussed the United States and its policies. The GAO's analysis of selected media products in the areas of apartheid, Palestine, disarmament, the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO), and a New International Economic Order, showed that about half of the products opposed key U.S. interests. The report recommended that the Secretary of State develop a review process to improve the monitoring of selected UN public information materials.

In the process of preparing a supplemental report entitled "United Nations: Content of and Charges for Radio Broadcasts Transmitted by the Voice of America" (GAO/NSIAD-86-114BR), the GAO found that the United Nations was being charged only the direct cost of transmission, \$30 per broadcast hour, for UN radio programs transmitted over Voice of America (VOA) facilities under a leasing arrangement with the United States Information Agency (USIA). As a result, USIA informed the United Nations in December 1985 that henceforth the rate would be \$179 per broadcast hour. In March 1986, the United Nations announced that, in view of budgetary restraints, it was suspending its broadcasts over VOA facilities.

Part 2

Economic, Social, Scientific and Human Rights Affairs

INTRODUCTION

Chapter III of the UN Charter established the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) as the principal organs of the United Nations responsible for the issues covered in Part 2 of this report. ECOSOC's limited membership (54 countries) has, however, led the developing countries to prefer the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies. In those fora they enjoy a maximum voting strength for substantive discussion and action on international economic issues, especially those directly related to development. As a result the General Assembly has created entities for substantive discussion and action on international economic issues, especially those directly related to development. The most important of these is the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies constitute the major fora for what has come to be called the North/South dialogue between developed and developing countries. The North/South distinction between developed and developing countries, however, tends to mask the significant differences within each group and to overlook the high degree of economic interdependence which exists between developed and developing countries and among developing countries themselves. In 1986, in concert with Group B (Western industrialized countries), the United States continued efforts to improve the functioning and efficiency of UNCTAD. Another area for North/South dialogue is the UN system review of the Third International Development Strategy. UNGA resolution 34/138 called for a "round of global and sustained negotiations" on several international economic issues, but there were no significant developments on this front during 1986.

The General Assembly, in its regular sessions, is organized into seven committees. The Second Committee is responsible pri-

marily for economic affairs, and the Third Committee for cultural, humanitarian, and social affairs. The committees receive some of their issues directly but most are passed to them by ECOSOC.

In 1986 reform was the key subject on the UN agenda and the Second Committee responded to a challenge from the U.S. Delegation to rededicate itself to its original mandate and produce concrete results. Meetings started on time, the number of speakers and resolutions declined, and the financial implications of resolutions passed came to zero. The United States seized the initiative by introducing its own resolutions on locusts and entrepreneurship, thereby helping to shape the terms of debate to coincide with U.S. interests. Passage of the Entrepreneurship resolution was especially significant in that, for the first time, it gave a mandate to the United Nations and its bodies to study and support an area of private sector economic activity. The United States reluctantly acquiesced in the inscription of an agenda item on debt, fearing that deliberation outside of the UN bodies possessing the proper mandate and expertise (IMF, IBRD), would lead to politicization of this delicate issue. In the end, however, we were able to join the consensus on a resolution which endorsed key elements of U.S. debt strategy, including the need for debtor countries to adopt structural adjustments. Our chief setback in the Second Committee in 1986 came on a Nicaraguan resolution criticizing our trade embargo against that country and calling for its revocation. In the face of procedural maneuvers which prevented a fair hearing of our balancing amendments, the U.S. Delegation walked out of the committee room before the final vote. (86 to 1 with 43 abstentions)

The Third Committee considered questions on racism, discrimination, self-determination, aging, crime, the disabled, youth, refugees, women, narcotics, and human rights. A U.S.-sponsored resolution on "The Right of Individuals to Own Property" passed over Soviet objections. Country-specific human rights resolutions passed on Afghanistan, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Iran. The United States cosponsored a resolution on religious intolerance and introduced a resolution on Cuba on which no action was taken at this session. The United States was the only country to vote against a G-77 resolution on "The Right to Development," and opposed a resolution on "Mercenaries" aimed at U.S. support for insurgents in Nicaragua, Afghanistan, and Angola.

All elements of the UN system primarily concerned with the issues in this section usually report to the General Assembly through ECOSOC. ECOSOC consists of its plenary body; five regional economic commissions, several functional commissions; and

a varying number of subcommissions, working groups, and expert groups. The regional economic commissions and many of the other bodies are covered in this part.

At its First Regular Session of 1986, ECOSOC adopted a U.S. resolution creating a rapporteur on religious intolerance, and a U.S. resolution on the disabled. At its second session, the United States first introduced its resolution on entrepreneurship and expended considerable energy in support of Israel's attempt to gain admission to the Economic Commission for Europe. The question of Israel's application was deferred to 1987.

The Critical Economic Situation in Africa

In May 1986 the General Assembly held a special session on "The Critical Economic Situation in Africa." The resolution authorizing the 13th Special Session of the General Assembly, called for a focus on African rehabilitation and long-term development, rather than drought-related emergency measures.

Africa had been selected as a priority topic for the UN discussion at the 1984 summer session of ECOSOC, and the momentum from those discussions carried through to the 39th UNGA which was held in the fall of that year. On the basis of a U.S. proposal, Africa was again selected as the priority topic for discussion at the summer ECOSOC in 1985. Additional impetus for the special session came from President Reagan in a conversation with President Abdou Diouf of Senegal, who was Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at the time.

A preparatory committee began its work in January of 1986 and continued to work through the spring of that year. The committee focused on the OAU's *African Priority Program for Economic Recovery, 1986-1990* (APPER), drafted in 1985, and a shorter document based upon the APPER, which had been drawn up for the UNGA Special Session through the collaboration of the OAU and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). Although this shorter document emphasized the need for developing African countries to undertake structural reform of their economies, to provide proper economic incentives, to assign priority to agriculture, and to encourage development of the private sector, it unfortunately also included certain elements which were unacceptable to the United States. Among the unacceptable points were specific detailed proposals for extraordinary measures to provide debt relief, and a request for \$46 billion in additional financial assistance from donor countries. The Preparatory Committee also produced a draft final declaration for consideration by the UNGA

Special Session which was similar in content, although shorter, than the previous documents.

The Chairman of the OAU, President Abdou Diouf, opened the special session with a temperate statement in which he said that Africa was ready to undertake difficult adjustment measures and to launch a major mobilization of internal resources. Secretary of State George Shultz headed the U.S. Delegation and delivered a speech in which he urged African countries to join in a worldwide movement to reject failed statist orthodoxies and to give greater scope for individual initiative and the private sector.

Negotiations on the text of the final declaration lasted until the early hours of the morning, and the Special Session itself was extended 24 hours beyond its scheduled closing date, before consensus on an agreed text was achieved. The United States was pleased that the final text retained acceptable language on policy reform, incentives, agricultural priorities, and the role of the private sector, without going beyond U.S. positions on debt and assistance. Also significant by its absence from a UN document were references to extraneous political issues, ideological posturing, and rhetorical excesses. In the long run, however, the importance of the 13th Special Session will be judged by the ability of African Governments to follow through on their commitment to bring about economic reforms, and to attract the resources required to support their priority program for economic recovery.

International Development Strategy

The International Development Strategy (IDS) for the 1980's was adopted by consensus in 1980 at the 35th Session of the UN General Assembly and was intended to provide a blueprint for international economic growth throughout the decade. Although the IDS endorses many development principles we advocate, it also has significant weaknesses—including overly ambitious and unrealistic growth targets for developing countries in the 1980's, and excessive dependence on official development assistance (ODA) for meeting its goals by calling for donor countries to reach an assistance target of 0.7 percent of GNP. Because of these weaknesses, the United States made a statement of reservation at the time of the adoption of the IDS.

A 1985 system-wide mid-term review of the Third IDS contained the first acknowledgement within the United Nations of an improvement in the world economy, and called for the Secretariat to study the implications of different development policies—which

we can use to advance policies which have been successful, i.e., reliance on market principles and the private sector.

IDS now appears regularly on the agenda of UN bodies and resolutions on economic and social development frequently refer to it. There was no significant activity on IDS during 1986, however.

Long-Term Trends in Economic Development

The General Assembly first showed an interest in long-term trends and forecasts at its 30th Session in 1975. Stating that an examination of long-term trends in the economic development of individual regions was of great importance for securing a rapid rate of economic development of all countries, in particular of developing countries, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive report on long-term trends and forecasts in the economic development of the various regions and their mutual relationship.

At its 32d Session, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare an overall socioeconomic perspective of the development of the world economy up to the year 2000. This report was 5 years in preparation and when it appeared in 1982, the United States found it to be unduly pessimistic and biased toward blaming international factors rather than domestic policies for the economic problems of developing countries while paying insufficient attention to the role of the private sector in development. Nevertheless, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare another comprehensive report for submission in 1985 and wanted to institutionalize the preparation of revised and updated reports every 3 years. The United States opposed this idea, largely because we feel that such reports are better handled by the IMF and the World Bank which possess greater economic expertise than the Secretariat.

At its 40th Session in 1985 the General Assembly took note of the Secretary-General's latest report on the overall socioeconomic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000, and charged him with revising and updating it in time for the 42d Session in 1987—2 years later. The United States opposed the resolution because it contained unacceptable references to the New International Economic Order and to the relationship between disarmament and development. The vote was 144 affirmative, 1 negative U.S., and 13 abstentions. (Resolution 40/207)

Economic Commission for Europe

The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), established in 1947, is one of five regional economic commissions which report to ECOSOC. It has 34 members—the European members plus Canada, Switzerland, and the United States. Other UN member countries take part, in a consultative capacity, when matters of particular concern to them are considered. Composed largely of developed nations, ECE focuses on problems confronting modern industrialized societies. Decisions are made by consensus reached in deliberations between Eastern and Western caucuses.

ECE's terms of reference are broad and over the years the nature of its work has paralleled changing European and Atlantic concerns. When first established, the ECE's principal focus was on European postwar economic reconstruction. Since then the Commission has evolved into a forum where East and West can consult on economic and technical problems of common interest. The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) specifically accorded the ECE a number of responsibilities for multilateral activity in economics, transportation, science, technology, and the environment.

The concluding document of the followup meeting of representatives of the participating states of the CSCE signed in Madrid in 1983 reaffirmed the ECE's role as a forum for implementing provisions relating to energy, trade, air pollution, and transport.

ECE carries out its activities principally through 15 specialized committees—Agricultural Problems; Chemical Industry; Coal; Electric Power; Gas; Housing, Building and Planning; Inland Transport; Steel; Timber; Development of Trade; Water Problems; Conference of European Statisticians; Senior Advisors on Environmental Problems; Senior Advisors on Science and Technology; Senior Economic Advisors; and a number of subsidiary bodies which deal with special problems included in the committees' programs. Additional subjects of interest to the Commission are dealt with by *ad hoc* groups, notably the Senior Advisors on Energy, the Group of Experts on Standardization Policies, and the Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation.

From time to time, and often in conjunction with other multilateral organizations such as the FAO and ILO, ECE convenes special symposia, seminars, and conferences. Study tours to member countries are occasionally arranged in connection with such meetings. A substantial number of U.S. Government depart-

ments and agencies, as well as congressional and private sector representatives, actively participate in ECE-sponsored meetings.

The Commission held its 41st Session April 15-26, 1986, in Geneva. After an inauspicious beginning which saw the U.S.S.R. and others attack the United States for its military action in Libya, the remainder of the session was characterized by 2 weeks of frustration during which neither East nor West achieved their objectives. The Commission was able to pass only relatively anodyne resolutions on the Mediterranean, management training, and the ECE's 40th anniversary, and the overall economic perspective was successfully negotiated, as well as a trade resolution which injected some new life into the ECE's East-West trade function.

All delegations agreed on the need for concentration and integration of ECE activities and the concept of greater coordination and effectiveness in ECE activities, but the Commission was unable to reach consensus on a resolution to this effect. The eastern countries have consistently forestalled action on this issue since a number of outdated or irrelevant programs are of interest to them and have traditionally been staffed largely by personnel from these countries. An Eastern initiative to schedule a 6th session of the Senior Advisors on Energy (SAE) was withdrawn in the face of staunch Western opposition.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) was established in 1947. The United States was one of the original 10 members. Presently there are 38 members and 9 associate members. Five members (France, Netherlands, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and U.S.) are from outside the region, which covers an extensive area from Mongolia south to New Zealand, and from Iran east to the island nations in the Pacific. ESCAP's headquarters are in Bangkok, although some subsidiary bodies and other activities are located in other Asian cities.

ESCAP's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the area of social and economic development, providing a forum for debate on development issues, providing technical assistance and advisory services, and helping members attract outside assistance. It does not itself provide capital resources, but helps establish institutions to attract funds for regional and subregional projects which, in turn, supply development assistance.

The annual Commission sessions provide the main guidance for ESCAP's program and activities, while the Secretariat prepares reports and compiles statistics on current economic issues in the region for distribution to member governments. It also prepares and services the meetings of the Commission and the following nine substantive committees: Agricultural Development; Development Planning; Industry, Human Settlements and Technology; Natural Resources; Population; Social Development; Statistics; Trade; and Shipping, Transport and Communications. The present work program and activities are concentrated in six priority areas: food and agriculture; energy; raw materials and commodities; transfer of technology; international trade; and integrated rural development.

ESCAP is primarily funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ESCAP receives funding from other UN agencies, especially UNDP, to which the United States is a major contributor. Finally, the United States has from time to time participated in individual ESCAP programs of special interest by providing extra-budgetary contributions.

The 42d Commission Session was held in Bangkok from April 22 to May 2. It adopted 13 resolutions on a variety of issues including the 40th anniversary of the Commission, the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH), the International Year of Peace, and the creation of a regional trade fair. The Commission also adopted a decision noting the associate memberships of the former Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and calling for action by ECOSOC to amend the terms of reference of the Commission to include these new associate members.

Much of the work of the 42d Session was characterized by criticism by developing countries about national and international economic issues such as protectionism, commodity prices, declining economic assistance, and stimulation of industrial growth. The U.S. Delegation continued to press U.S. positions on an open trading system, market-oriented development strategies, the important role of the private sector, and the need for better use of UN system resources. Political rhetoric was relatively mild by ECOSOC standards, although the Soviet Delegation and its allies attacked the United States on several occasions about U.S. military action in Libya.

Particularly disturbing to the United States, the Soviet Union attempted on the last day of the Session to change the text of a Mongolian resolution which the United States and the U.S.S.R. had previously agreed upon in the Drafting Committee. This was clearly a violation of the longstanding principle of good-faith

agreements in committee and jeopardized future negotiations on difficult issues outside the plenary.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) was established in 1948 as a regional organization to promote the economic development of Latin America and to strengthen economic ties among Latin American countries and between them and the rest of the world. To this end, ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. ECLAC has 35 Western Hemisphere members (including the United States and Canada), 4 nonregional members (France, United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Portugal), and 4 associate members (British Virgin Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands, Netherlands Antilles, and Montserrat). ECLAC has its headquarters in Santiago, Chile, and has branch offices in Washington, D.C., and in six Latin American countries.

ECLAC's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the region in the area of economic development. ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. The biannual Commission sessions provide guidance for ECLAC's programs and activities.

ECLAC is primarily funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ECLAC receives funding from other UN agencies, especially UNDP and UNFPA, as well as from bilateral sources.

ECLAC's General Sessions or Plenaries are held in even years usually in a different Latin American capital each time. The 21st ECLAC plenary met in Mexico City, April 17-25, 1986, to discuss the implementation of the International Development Strategy and the debt crisis in Latin America. The Commission adopted 13 resolutions, 11 by consensus. Those not adopted by consensus included an unbalanced Latin resolution on external debt (opposed by the United States and five other western member countries) and a resolution to hold an Extraordinary Session of ECLAC in Mexico City in January, 1987, to consider debt and other economic issues (the United States alone abstained).

Other resolutions adopted by the 21st Session related to, *inter alia*, the program of work for the period 1988-89, technical support to Latin American and Caribbean countries in connection with the upcoming round of multinational trade negotiations, the 1987 International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH), and support for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).

The Latin American debt crisis dominated the proceedings of the 21st Session. The ECLAC Latin American and Caribbean Group (ECLAC members excluding the United States and other industrialized countries) circulated an extremely unbalanced and unrealistic document that advanced the Latin view that external factors were the cause of the region's economic difficulties. In response, the United States stressed the need for appropriate structural adjustment policies, including support for the private sector. The United States was unsuccessful in moderating the language of the Latin resolution on external debt, but did succeed in having the ECLAC work program include a mandate to study forms of expanded capital ownership in the means of production. The U.S. statement to the plenary, delivered by Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Alan L. Keyes, focused on the need for a partnership of freedom between governments and their private sectors. The address was favorably received by the Latins although few of the Latin Delegations were willing to endorse U.S. proposals publicly.

The Economic Commission for Africa

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) was established in 1958 as a regional organization to promote economic development in Africa. Full membership is limited to independent African countries of which 51 are currently members. The United States, while not a member, supports the Commission's activities by maintaining liaison with ECA headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, attending some of its meetings as an observer, and providing financial and technical assistance through the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

The ECA is charged with promoting the economic and social development of Africa, strengthening economic relations among African countries and territories, undertaking studies on economic development, collecting, evaluating and disseminating economic and technical information, and helping to formulate policies to

promote economic development. ECA also provides advisory services to its members in various economic and social fields.

The ECA is funded primarily by the UN regular budget. In addition, the ECA receives funding from other UN agencies and bilateral donors. USAID concluded a technical assistance agreement with the ECA in 1983 to provide \$710,000 during 1983-87 to be used for the support of two projects which will: (a) strengthen human resources planning and development management training at the Institute for Economic Development and Planning in Dakar, Senegal, and (b) improve the communications capability of ECA's African Training and Research Center for Women.

ECA's 12th Ministerial meeting was held in Yaounde, Cameroon, April 17-21, 1986. The Commission reviewed its program of work for the biennium 1986-87 and adopted 26 resolutions relating to, *inter alia*, the following topics: women and development; trade and development finance; development of tourism in Africa; the Industrial Development Decade in Africa; and the UN Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.

Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia

The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) was established in 1974. Currently, there are 14 members including the PLO. Although a UN member of the region involved, Israel was effectively excluded from membership because of the original wording of the 1973 ECOSOC resolution establishing the Commission. The United States objected at the time, considering that the language was contrary to the terms of the UN Charter. The Commission's headquarters were moved from Beirut to Baghdad in 1981 because of war damage in Beirut. The name of the Commission was changed in 1986 from the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) to its current name to reflect the Commission's greater emphasis on social issues. ESCWA is funded by the UN regular budget.

The 128th Session of ESCWA was held April 19-24, 1986, in Baghdad. In addition to ESCWA members, several countries attended the meeting as observers, including the United States.

The Commission's program of work for 1986-87 comprises the following program areas: Food and Agriculture, Development Issues and Policies, Human Settlements, International Trade and Development Finance, Natural Resources, Industrial Development, Environment, Energy, Population, Public Administration and Finance, Science and Technology, Social Development, Statis-

tics, Transport and Communications, Transnational Corporations, and Management of Technical Cooperation Activities.

United Nations Development Program

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) is a voluntary fund which finances the world's largest multilateral program of grant technical assistance (advisory services, fellowships, demonstration and training equipment). UNDP was established in 1966 through the merger of two earlier UN programs, the Special Fund, and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. The General Assembly established UNDP to be the principal UN mechanism for financing technical assistance activities. UNDP provides grant technical assistance to developing countries and territories at their request, with increasing emphasis on assistance to the poorest countries. In 1986, UNDP projects were underway in some 150 countries and territories.

UNDP's programs consist of projects lasting from a few months to several years in agriculture (land and water utilization, food processing), industry (product development, pilot plants), education (teacher training, literacy programs), health (maternal and child health care services, medical training), economic policy and planning (institutes for economic planning, national statistical services), transportation (water and air transportation, rural transportation), and natural resource exploration (mining techniques, mineral exploration techniques). UNDP also undertakes smaller projects such as fellowships for the training of nationals of developing countries and provides such countries with needed skills through the use of expert advisers.

In addition, UNDP undertakes preinvestment and feasibility studies to promote developing country and external investor interest in capital projects aimed at expanding production and employment. Projects are normally executed for UNDP by one of the 29 participating agencies of the UN system, such as FAO, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), UNIDO, ILO, UNESCO, World Bank, or ICAO. UNDP also directly undertakes a small number of projects through its own Office for Projects Execution.

UNDP headquarters is located in New York. Its Administrator, William H. Draper III, a citizen of the United States, assumed his office in May 1986. His present term expires December 31, 1989.

GOVERNING AND ADVISORY BODIES

UNDP is a subsidiary organ of the UN General Assembly, which sets overall UNDP policy. UNDP's operating policies are established and its programs and budgets, approved by a Governing Council composed of representatives of 48 states—21 developed and 27 developing.* The Governing Council reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC, which elects states to the Council for 3-year terms. The United States has been a member of the Governing Council since its establishment and plays a leading role in UNDP affairs. The Council holds regular sessions once each year in June. There is a brief organizational meeting of the Council in February each year.

The UNDP Governing Council provided oversight for the following bodies in 1986: UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, UN Sudano-Sahelian Office, UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, UN Trust Fund for Colonial Countries and Peoples, Energy Account, UN Special Fund for Landlocked Developing Countries, UN Development Fund for Women, Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries, and the Interagency Procurement Services Unit. The Council also provides policy guidance for the small program of technical assistance financed from the regular UN budget, and is the governing body for the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA).

SECRETARIAT AND FIELD ORGANIZATION

UNDP's administrative apparatus consists of a Secretariat in New York and 112 offices in developing countries and territories where specific programs are being carried out. Assisted by their staffs, UNDP Resident Representatives advise recipient governments on economic development planning and UN assistance. Within their countries of assignment, Resident Representatives coordinate UNDP programs and, where appropriate, those of the UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, the UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration and UNFPA. Resident Representatives also act for and support other UN agencies including the World Food Program, the UN Environment Pro-

* The following states were members of the UNDP Governing Council in 1986: Argentina, Kuwait, Austria, Malawi, Bahrain, Mauritania, Bangladesh, Mauritius, Belgium, Mexico, Benin, Netherlands, Brazil, New Zealand, Bulgaria, Norway, Burundi, Pakistan, Cameroon, Poland, Canada, Republic of Korea, Cape Verde, Saudi Arabia, Chile, Spain, Republic Peoples of China, Swaziland, Cuba, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Ethiopia, Syrian Arab Republic, France, Togo, Fed. Republic of Germany, Tunisia, Hungary, Turkey, India, U.S.S.R., Italy, United Kingdom, Jamaica, United States, Japan, Venezuela.

gram, the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development, and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. In most countries, the UN Secretary-General has designated the UNDP Resident Representative as Resident Coordinator of the UN Operational Activities for Development. As such, the Resident Representative is responsible for overseeing all UN agency development activities in the country to which he/she is accredited.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Patterns of Development Assistance

UNDP development assistance is allocated to countries and intercountry activities based on anticipated development assistance allocations called Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs), which cover 5-year planning cycles. The First Planning Cycle extended from 1972 through 1976, the Second Cycle was from 1977 through 1981, the Third Cycle was from 1982 through 1986, and the Fourth Cycle begins in 1987 and will run through 1991. IPFs in the First Cycle were set largely on the basis of the assistance that UNDP had supplied from 1967 through 1971. That is, countries had a claim upon UNDP resources during that cycle equal to the percentage of UNDP assistance they actually received in the earlier 5-year period. IPF figures for the Second Planning Cycle were primarily based on country populations and per capita GNPs. In allocating the IPFs for the Third Cycle, the Governing Council gave highest priority to countries with the lowest per capita GNPs or which were otherwise disadvantaged (Decision 80/30, adopted without a vote June 26, 1980). For the Fourth Cycle, about 64 percent of country program resources will be allocated to countries with a per capita GNP of \$375 or less.

Activities and Analysis

The Organizational Meeting for the 33d Session met in February 1986 in New York. The Council completed the setting up of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole, which thereafter held its first meeting, February 24-25. The Council also grappled with the issue of scheduling sufficient sessions for the Committee of the Whole, to permit serious review of 49 country programs. The Council heard detailed proposals for reducing the volume of documentation and improving its timeliness.

The Special Session met immediately following the Organizational Meeting. The deliberations of the Special Session focused on the report of the Department of Technical Cooperation for De-

velopment (DTCD), and included a vigorous debate on the 1986-87 budget proposed for the United Nations Development Fund for Women. The Council also addressed the national allocation of funds set aside for Special Program Resources, the designation of the Frontline States (States bordering South Africa) used in the application of supplementary criteria in the calculation of Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs), and the proposed closing of UNDP field offices in Romania and Yugoslavia.

The Governing Council held its 33d Session in June in Geneva, Switzerland. It took a number of decisions related to operational activities and technical cooperation, drug abuse control, population questions, human resources development, and the participation of women in development. Several decisions dealt with economic and social needs in Africa, including: assistance to National Liberation Movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU); the role of UNDP in the Program of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development, 1986-90; the IPF for Namibia; and aid to the Sudano-Sahelian region.

The Council also:

- approved appropriations of \$334.199 thousand (gross) to finance the 1986-87 biennial budget,

- allocated \$4 million from the Special Programme Resources remaining unallocated in the Third Cycle for financing assistance to the Palestinian people,

- urged the UNDP Administrator to take further steps to increase procurement by UNDP from developing countries,

- requested the Administrator to pursue measures to improve program and project quality and to intensify his efforts to improve the performance of agencies executing UNDP projects,

- endorsed efforts of the Administrator to raise the quality of evaluations and ensure better compliance with UNDP's internal evaluation procedures,

- decided that field offices in Belgrade and Bucharest should be maintained on the understanding that from 1987 onward there would be no net additional cost to the biennial UNDP budget over and above costs that would have been incurred in administering the Yugoslav and Romanian programs from the UNDP office in Geneva,

- approved 44 country programs representing more than \$1 billion in development assistance, and

- approved the extension of the Committee of the Whole and its working group for one more year.

The United States contributed \$138.115 thousand to UNDP in 1986, down from \$165 million in 1985. Our contribution represented 17.84 percent of resources pledged for 1986.

UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

INTRODUCTION

Formed in 1967, the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) seeks to promote industrial development and assist in accelerating industrialization of the developing countries. To accomplish its task, UNIDO works with the private sector and encourages investment as a means of fostering development. Membership in UNIDO is open to all members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the IAEA. At the end of 1986, 142 Member States belonged to UNIDO.

NEW STATUS

On January 1, 1986, UNIDO was converted into an independent specialized agency of the UN system, culminating an effort started in 1975. The U.S. Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of the UNIDO Constitution on June 21, 1983; the President deposited the instrument of ratification with the UN Secretary-General on September 2, 1983, and the Constitution entered into force on June 21, 1985. The United States has participated in UNIDO through the United Nations since 1967.

UNIDO MEETINGS

UNIDO's three governing bodies are the Program and Budget Committee (PBC), Industrial Development Board (IDB), and General Conference. All Member States may participate in the Conference, which meets biennially. The Conference last met in December, 1985 in Vienna, and the next meeting is scheduled for November, 1987 in Bangkok.

The 27-member PBC* meets annually. The PBC held its second session, May 12-16, to conduct a mid-term review of the 1986-87 biennium regular (assessed) budget and program of work. The financial situation of UNIDO assumed primary importance

* The members of the PBC are: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Netherlands, Nigeria, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United States.

because reduced receipts had produced a serious cash flow problem. UNIDO's income shortfall was attributable to reduced or delayed payments in members' assessed contributions and an adverse exchange rate. By the end of 1986, over 90 members had fallen into arrears and UNIDO had received only 70.8 percent of contributions due. The 1986-87 budget was based on an anticipated exchange rate of 17.70 Austrian schillings to the U.S. dollar, but, during 1986, the actual rate was AS 15.32=USD 1.00, resulting in losses of \$5,078,900.

The PBC requested the Director General to identify possible reductions in expenditures (urging selective, rather than across-the-board, cuts) and to submit a list of proposals to the IDB. The PBC requested the Director General to review alternative systems of preparing budget estimates and of assessing the members. One alternative was the dual schilling-dollar system already in use by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The PBC also called on the Director General to consider alternative financing arrangements (that is, other than the regular budget) for Senior Industrial Development Field Advisors (SIDFAs), and to change the format of budget presentations to show expenditures by substantive programs rather than by organizational units. The PBC reached all its decisions by consensus.

The IDB met in special session on May 15 (during the PBC) to consider the Director General's appointment of five new deputy directors general. The United States and several Western Delegations expressed reservations regarding this increase in senior-level staff.

The second (regular) session of the 53-member IDB** met, October 13-23, to review the main elements of UNIDO's program of work, but consideration of UNIDO's financial situation again occupied much of the Board's time.

The Board approved the following industrial sectors for consultations in 1988-89 under UNIDO's System of Consultations: food processing (two meetings), fertilizers/pesticides, small and medium-scale enterprises, transport equipment, and electronics. The Board's decision urged the Secretariat to encourage increased participation by industrialists in the process of consultation.

** The members of the IDB are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

The IDB established a working group to report to the General Conference in November on the Director General's proposals for using new concepts and approaches in industrial development. These proposals call for, *inter alia*, a more active role for UNIDO as a "broker" between the interests of developing countries interests and the private sector of developed countries.

Consideration of UNIDO's financial situation resulted in decisions noting the Director General's proposals for economy measures in the amount of \$12.6 million and authorizing the Director General to defer program expenditures as necessary. The IDB further authorized the Director General to borrow up to \$16 million from the United Nations in 1986-87 and to negotiate with the UN Secretary-General a deferred repayment schedule.

Several "political" agenda items resulted in IDB decisions taken by vote rather than consensus. Three decisions on technical assistance to Palestinian, Namibian, and South African peoples all called for implementing such assistance in cooperation with political entities: the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), the South West Africa Peoples' Organization (SWAPO), and the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan African Congress (PAC), respectively. The U.S. Delegation called for votes on these decisions. All carried: Palestine, 33 to 1 (U.S.) with 8 abstentions; Namibia, 34 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions; South Africa, 36 to 6 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The U.S. explanation of vote deplored the politicization of the technically-oriented Board meeting.

A resumed second session of the PBC met, October 15 (during the IDB) and recommended an increase of 3 million dollars—to a total of 9 million dollars—for the Working Capital Fund. The PBC recommendation passed by a vote of 19 to 1 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. The IDB adopted the increase by a vote of 37 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

INVESTMENT PROMOTION SERVICE

The Investment Promotion Service (IPS) is part of UNIDO's Industrial Investment Division, which attempts to attract investors and investment capital from developed countries to developing countries. The North American IPS office relocated from New York to Washington in December 1986. Its new program of work emphasizes increased and direct cooperation with the U.S. private sector at the level of industry associations, state and regional development associations, chambers of commerce, and individual firms. In 1986, the United States did not contribute to the IPS office through the International Organizations and Programs (IO&P) account, and USAID funding was discontinued in October,

prior to the office move to Washington. The other six IPS offices worldwide are fully funded by the host governments.*

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is an international agreement which entered into force in January 1948. It is not technically part of the United Nations system, although it was created at a conference sponsored by the United Nations and it cooperates with UN agencies where appropriate, as in promotion of exports from developing countries. The United States has been a party to GATT since its inception. In 1986, with the accession of Mexico and Morocco, 92 countries, accounting for more than four-fifths of world trade, were members. An additional 30 countries maintain a *de facto* "application" of GATT and one country, Tunisia, has acceded provisionally.

GATT is the principal multilateral instrument through which the United States seeks to improve the world trading system. It is both a code of rules and a forum in which negotiations and other trade discussions take place. GATT is intended to play a major role in the settlement of trade disagreements between member countries.

The most recent of the seven multilateral rounds of trade negotiations under GATT auspices was the Tokyo Round, launched in September 1973 and completed in 1979. In addition to tariff reductions, for the first time, the Tokyo Round produced agreement on rules of conduct in non-tariff areas. The following went into effect in January 1980: Codes on subsidies and countervailing duties; technical barriers to trade (standards); import licensing procedures; antidumping; and trade in bovine meat, dairy products, and civil aircraft. The codes covering government procurement and customs valuation went into effect at the beginning of 1981. The work program adopted in November 1979 gave first priority to implementing the Tokyo Round results, and Committees have been established to administer each of the code agreements.

In November 1982, the Contracting Parties met at Ministerial level for the first time in nearly 10 years. The depressed worldwide trade and economic situation created a climate in which the United States felt it was particularly important to address the emerging issues of the 1980's as well as to advance unfinished pro-

* The other offices are in Austria, France, F.R.G., Japan, Switzerland, and Poland. An eighth office is scheduled to open in Milan, Italy, in 1987.

grams. Areas of concentration include implementation of the political declaration, which calls for resistance to protectionism through achievement of a safeguards understanding, agriculture, developing country concerns, services, and trade in high-technology goods.

Although the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations contributed significantly to trade liberalization, it soon became evident that another round of trade negotiations was needed to come to grips with remaining impediments to trade, especially to trade in services. In 1985 the GATT Contracting Parties agreed to establish a Preparatory Committee which would prepare for the initiation of a new round of multilateral trade negotiations at a Ministerial meeting scheduled for September 1986.

Ministers from GATT Member States successfully launched a new round of multilateral trade negotiations (MTN) at Punta del Este on September 20, calling it the Uruguay Round. The Uruguay Round is a key element in the Administration's efforts to open markets and reduce global protectionism.

The Ministerial agreement to launch the Uruguay Round (GATT document MIN/DEC, 20 September 1986) launches a Negotiations on Goods and a Negotiations on Services as part of a single multilateral trade negotiation. Ministers agreed to establish a Trade Negotiations Committee to manage the overall negotiations and two negotiating groups to carry out the negotiations: a Group on Negotiations on Goods to negotiate traditional GATT issues (and investment and intellectual property) and a Group on Negotiations on Services to deal with services matters.

After the Punta del Este Ministerial, the focus of the Uruguay Round negotiations shifted to Geneva. The United States will take a strong leadership role in the negotiations.

UN Conference on Trade and Development

In addition to the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly, the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is the principal organ of the General Assembly concerned with discussion of issues of economic development. A plenary session is convened at intervals of 3 or 4 years. The Seventh Session of the Conference, UNCTAD VII, will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, July 9-31, 1987.

Resolution 1995 (XIX) of the General Assembly established UNCTAD on December 30, 1964. Members of the conference are the states which are members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, or the International Atomic Energy Agency. Any member desiring to do so may be a member of the executive body

of the conference, the Trade and Development Board (TDB). The Board (TDB) meets twice a year and reports to the General Assembly, as well as to the Plenary Sessions of UNCTAD.

UNCTAD has considered the major areas of development activity, including trade, money and finance, commodities, economic cooperation among developing countries, and other issues. U.S. officials were disappointed with the results of the last session, UNCTAD VI held in 1983, because of the introduction of extraneous political resolutions onto the agenda and work program for the conference, and because of the insistence of the Group of 77 developing countries (G-77) that the Session endorse the so-called "new international economic order" (NIEO) program for economic growth, which developed countries have resisted.

As a result of disappointment with the conduct and outcome of UNCTAD VI, the United States led an initiative beginning in 1984 on the part of the western industrialized countries to reform UNCTAD's management and the operation of its programs. The United States hoped to increase efficiency and influence the Conference to move away from its customary agenda, heavily imbued with rhetoric and emphasizing transfers of wealth to developing countries, toward a more realistic one which considers the importance of domestic economic policy and the effectiveness of market-oriented policies to sustained economic growth and development.

Following the departure of long-time Secretary-General Gamani Corea, Deputy Secretary-General Alister McIntyre served as officer-in-charge for most of 1985. McIntyre responded to the reform agenda, and took important initial steps which included an attempt to streamline the UNCTAD bureaucracy and to introduce greater objectivity in the Secretariat's work on key background papers. McIntyre had some success; further progress, however, has been slow. In November Kenneth Dadzie was appointed as permanent Secretary-General of UNCTAD for a 3-year term beginning January 1, 1986.

Mr. Dadzie is the fourth Secretary-General of UNCTAD. At the time of his appointment he was Ghana's High Commissioner in London and he came to his new responsibilities with extensive experience with UN policy and organizational matters, having served as Director General for Development and International Economic Cooperation in New York. His appointment was anticipated as a move to reinvigorate the UNCTAD reform effort. This has been well borne out to some extent.

During 1986 UNCTAD made little headway on any major substantive issue under consideration. Much of the effort of the delegations and the secretariat was devoted to preparation for the

UNCTAD VII Session. Major decisions taken during two meetings of the TDB and in the interim, included the site, and the provisional agenda for the session. Eventually, Geneva was chosen as the site, following earlier consideration of Havana. After extensive discussion, the Board adopted a provisional agenda for UNCTAD VII consisting of four major topics (trade issues, commodities issues, financial and other resources, and aid issues) together with formal and informal understandings on the part of the Secretary General. The United States voted against the adoption of the agenda because it did not provide for a new, productive direction for the organization. The United States proposed such a direction through consideration of the role of the private sector in development, or the importance of the policies of developing countries as a determinant of their prospects for economic growth.

At year's end, both developed and developing countries were planning for new rounds of consultations involving both representatives in Geneva and officials in capitals. There is growing recognition among officials of key developing countries that efforts undertaken in UNCTAD have not resulted in the broad agreements with developed countries that some had envisioned. Intense discussion leading up to UNCTAD VII has not yet produced agreement between western countries and the G-77 on the future role or direction of the Conference. UNCTAD VII will be a testing ground for the organization, particularly in the ability of its membership and the secretariat to demonstrate pragmatic rather than rhetorical approaches to development problems, and to find a role, perhaps less comprehensive, for the organization in support of real development needs.

Economic Cooperation Among Developing Countries (ECDC)

UNCTAD's Committee on ECDC met in November 1985. Group B and the United States specifically used the occasion to emphasize the need for both "transparency and universality" in the work of the Committee, as well as in the expected trade negotiations to take place in the context of ECDC. The Global System of Trade Preferences (GSTP) program, which is to establish a process of tariff reduction negotiations among G-77 countries, was singled out specifically for criticism. Currently, several developing countries which are not members of the Group of 77 are excluded; these include Israel, Turkey, Bulgaria, and China.

Group B and China have consequently cautioned the G-77 about the lack of universality in this UN-sponsored program. Group B has called upon the G-77 to open the GSTP negotiations to all developing countries. To date, the G-77's stated position has

been that while transparency and universality must be observed with regard to activities carried out under UNCTAD's regular budget, the GSTP, which is financed as a technical assistance project, is not subject to these rules. The United States as well as many Group B countries strongly oppose this position, and the G-77 has been warned that it will lose support among the developed countries for this activity if the Group does not meet demands for universality and transparency in the organization and implementation of GSTP.

Transfer of Technology

The UN Conference on International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology met in May 1985 for its sixth session of negotiations. As drafted, the Code would concern agreements to transfer industrial property, know-how, or to install, operate, or finance plant and equipment, as well as other forms of commercial technology transfer. The preamble to the draft Code notes that all countries should have equal access to technology on mutually agreed, mutually advantageous terms, and that developing countries should receive special treatment in this regard. Because of continued differences over the emphasis to be given to state regulation as opposed to the rights of parties to reach mutual agreement on contract terms, no agreement was reached on the unresolved elements of a proposed code text. Informal consultations were held in 1986, but the Secretary-General reported to the General Assembly that little progress had been made. The Assembly asked that UNCTAD try again in 1987, using a more structured process of consultation.

In 1986 the Committee on Transfer of Technology met and approved a work program for the UNCTAD Secretariat. This work will include studies on new and emerging technologies, small and medium-sized enterprises, and innovation. The Committee will meet again in the fall of 1988 to consider the results of this work.

CODE ON RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

A United Nations Conference on Restrictive Business practices agreed in April 1980 on a set of "Multilateral Agreed Principles and Rules for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices" (the Set). The Set was adopted by the General Assembly in December 1980. Its provisions are recommendations only; there is no binding dispute-settlement mechanism nor any provision obligating parties to examine any particular dispute. By its participa-

tion, the United States sought to gain more general application of anti-trust laws and legal standards to promote competition.

An Inter-Governmental Group of Experts (IGE) was created within UNCTAD as a body to monitor the agreement. The IGE met several times after 1981 and has broadened its activities to include work on other aspects of restrictive business practices. It has, for example, begun preparation of a handbook on RBP legislation, and has reviewed a draft model law which is intended to assist governments of developing countries to draft effective legislation in this area. In 1986, as in 1983, the IGE determined that work should continue on the handbook and that the model law should be further revised. However, Group B Delegations and those of the G-77 differ as to the direction this work should take. While this debate has continued without resolution, UNCTAD was able to organize a seminar in Africa which attracted participants from 20 countries interested in implementing RBP legislation.

A General Review Conference on the Agreement was held in November 1985. Developing countries pressed to make implementation of the Set obligatory, and to change the IGE into a group to oversee compliance by signatories. Developed countries (Group B) argued that these measures are neither desirable nor appropriate and the Conference referred the question of further action on the Set to the General Assembly. In 1986 it was agreed that the next Review Conference would be held in 1990; that the Code will not be changed until then; and that the IGE will continue to function according to its current mandate to monitor implementation of the Agreement.

PROTECTIONISM AND STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT

While no decision was taken over whether Resolution 159(VI), which called for a review of the international trading system, should be a one-time offer (Group B and U.S. position) or an ongoing review (G-77 and Group D position), such a review was conducted during the second part of the 33d TDB.

LINER CODE. The only subject for a binding code of conduct has been developed by UNCTAD is the Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences (Code). The Code was adopted in April 1974, but took effect only in October 1983 upon completion of ratification procedures. At present, about 65 countries, representing 29 percent of the total liner tonnage have acceded to the Code. As provided in the Code itself, a periodic review conference is scheduled for 1988.

The Code is intended to assist developing countries to build up their fleets by assuring a share of cargo on their trade routes

through cargo-sharing formulas. The Code also seeks to protect shippers from arbitrary actions by allowing them to form councils to negotiate rates and terms of service and provides a dispute-settlement mechanism.

The United States has not ratified the Code and does not intend to do so, based on our view that the provisions of the Code would cartelize the transportation of trade and would exclude competition in cargo allocation.

Substantial New Program of Action (SNPA)

In October 1985, the United States participated in UNCTAD's Mid-Term Review of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries (SNPA). Adopted in 1981, the SNPA called both on industrialized countries and on the least developed countries themselves, to mobilize financial resources, expand trade and investment, develop and implement sound economic structural adjustment policies, and improve, in general, coordination of aid efforts throughout the remainder of the 1980's. The 1985 Mid-Term Review found little improvement and, in some cases, significant deterioration in the conditions faced by the poorest countries, resulting from internal causes including drought, as well as uneven progress toward economic reform, structural adjustment, and domestic resource mobilization. These conditions were aggravated by external factors such as global recession, low prices for export commodities, high interest rates, and a strong dollar. The United States joined other participants in the Mid-Term Review in reaffirming the SNPA's original objectives and balanced approach, and supported the decision to have a retrospective review of the SNPA in 1990 in a forum and locale to be determined. The United States disassociated itself, on the other hand, from a call for aid target levels tied to the GNP of donor countries and from proposed direct intervention in world commodity markets through an UNCTAD-sponsored Common Fund. In 1986 UNCTAD adopted a provisional agenda for the Seventh Session of the Conference (to be held in July 1987) which calls for consideration of progress in implementation of the SNPA.

Commission on Transnational Corporations

The Commission on Transnational Corporations (TNCs) was established in 1975 by ECOSOC Resolution 19B (LVII) to assist the Council "in fulfilling its responsibilities in the field of trans-

national corporations." Its mandate includes: (1) acting as the forum within the UN system for consideration of issues relating to transnational corporations; (2) promoting the exchange of views between and among governments and nongovernmental groups; (3) providing guidance to the Center on Transnational Corporations, and; (4) developing a Code of Conduct relating to TNCs.

The 12th Session of the UN Commission on TNCs was held April 9-18. The meeting addressed the recurring issues of the Commission and the Center on TNCs. Among these were:

—Definition of TNCs. The United States and other Western governments pressed this issue once again by introducing a resolution on universality which states that all TNCs, whether state-owned, private, or mixed, and whether based in developed market economies, LDCs, or communist countries, should be included within the scope of the work of the Commission and the Center. A resolution was adopted which recognized that the term "TNCs" means all such enterprises, and called upon the Secretary-General to report further on this subject at the 13th Session of the Commission.

—TNC Involvement in South Africa. The G-77, led by African members, made strong statements on the evil of apartheid and alleged that TNCs contributed to the economic and political welfare of the repressive South African regime. It insisted that the only answer was for TNCs to withdraw from South Africa. The United States reiterated its strong abhorrence of apartheid, stating that the problem was not one of principle, but rather of tactics on how best to accomplish change.

The United States referred to the importance of the Sullivan Principles as a means of fostering constructive change in South Africa and expressed the view that to withdraw would penalize the very people the United States is seeking to support. The G-77 introduced a resolution which endorsed the report and recommendations of the "Panel of Eminent Persons" on the activities of TNCs in South Africa. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 32 to 3 (U.S., U.K., Switzerland) with 6 abstentions.

The Reconvened Special Session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations met for 2 weeks in January and on April 15 with the purpose of narrowing the differences and reaching a compromise on the major outstanding issues of the draft UN Code of Conduct on TNCs. The Special Session failed, however, to produce a noteworthy result because many developing countries showed little flexibility on most of the outstanding code issues, particularly those of explicit references to international law, national treatment, free transfers and expropriation, and compensa-

tion. In October the UN Center on TNCs organized a special "roundtable" on the code at Montreaux, Switzerland. No significant progress was achieved at this meeting.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was founded in 1946 to help meet the emergency needs of children in the aftermath of World War II. It now provides long-term humanitarian assistance to needy children and mothers in developing countries throughout the world, and promotes and supports health and development activities directed toward child survival and other needs of children. Because of its apolitical character, UNICEF has been able to operate all over the world, including areas in political turmoil such as El Salvador, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Uganda, and Sri Lanka.

UNICEF is a voluntarily-funded organization. In 1986 UNICEF received \$227 million in voluntary contributions to its general resources from 127 governments. The U.S. Government contributed \$51.4 million, making it the largest contributor (accounting for almost 23 percent of these governmental contributions). Other major donors included the Governments of Sweden (\$31.1 million, 13.7 percent), Norway (21.9 million, 9.6 percent), Italy (\$21.6 million, 9.5 percent), Japan (\$15.5 million, 6.8 percent), Finland (\$11.4 million, 4.9 percent), Netherlands (\$11.3 million, 5.0 percent), and Canada (\$10.5 million, 4.6 percent).

In addition to implementing projects from general resources, UNICEF also identifies many worthwhile projects each year for which it does not have funds in its general resources. These "noted projects" are listed in an annual catalog approved by the Executive Board and are only implemented if donors contribute additional funds for a specific project. In addition, UNICEF sometimes appeals for emergency funds to assist children and mothers affected by natural or human disasters. In 1986 governments and intergovernmental agencies such as the Arab Gulf Fund and the European Common Market contributed some \$120.8 million to UNICEF in supplementary funds for noted projects and emergencies. The United States donated approximately \$8.8 million in supplementary funds in 1986, \$6 million going to child survival activities in Africa, and the remainder for emergency assistance to Africa. The United States Agency for International Development also contributed an additional \$7.7 million in "donations-in-kind" to UNICEF—not reflected in the supplementary funds—in the form of food and vehicles.

In addition to contributions from governments, UNICEF also receives substantial income from private and other nongovernmental donors each year. For example, in 1986, UNICEF received \$88.7 million from nongovernmental sources plus the net profits from the sale of greeting cards throughout the world. This amount represented 19.2 percent of its total net income (i.e., both general resources and supplementary funds). UNICEF's success in raising funds from these sources is unique in the UN system and is largely due to the fund-raising activities of 34 national committees and four liaison offices.

The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, a nonprofit organization which has 3 million volunteers throughout all 50 states, is the largest and among the most active of these national committees.

UNICEF has its headquarters in New York. The current Executive Director is James Grant, a U.S. citizen, who has held this position since January 1, 1980. In 1984, the Secretary-General announced the reappointment of Mr. Grant for another 5-year term, through December 31, 1989.

The Executive Director receives policy guidance and direction from the UNICEF Executive Board composed of 41 Member States elected for 3-year terms. The United States has always been a member of this Board. The Board meets annually. Special sessions or mail polls may be used to decide issues which cannot wait until the next regular session of the Board.

In 1986 UNICEF spent \$326 million on projects in 118 countries. This amount included: \$119.4 million (36.6 percent) for child health activities, \$17.1 million (5.3 percent) for child nutrition, \$58.2 million (17.9 percent) for water supply and sanitation, \$17.6 million (5.4 percent) for formal education, \$13.1 million (4.0 percent) for non-formal education, \$32.1 million (9.8 percent) for emergency relief, and \$52.3 million (16.1 percent) for general projects not elsewhere classified.

UNICEF programs emphasize developing community-level services to promote the health and well-being of children, including water supply, primary health care, nutrition, education, and improvement of the situation of mothers. They also assist governments in recipient countries through advisory services, inter-country exchanges, and other local training exercises. In addition, UNICEF helps procure, package, and deliver medical and other health or education supplies through its centralized supply procurement, packaging, and warehousing system, UNIPAC, located in Copenhagen, Denmark. UNICEF is the largest supplier of vaccines to countries for the WHO Expanded Program of Immuniza-

tion, which has as its goal the immunization of all the world's children against the childhood immunizable diseases by 1990.

UNICEF allocates resources among countries on the basis of need, using criteria that include: infant mortality rates (IMR), infant morbidity, infant population, and per capita GNP. In 1983, the UNICEF Executive Board decided that the IMR should be the most important criterion that would "guide both the level and the content of UNICEF program cooperation." UNICEF's programs are carefully developed and tailored to the recipient country's specific needs on the basis of a child needs assessment. It is rare that UNICEF funds are the sole source of support for a program; they serve instead as a catalyst or critical ingredient to ensure the program's success.

In the early 1980's, the world health community recognized that several curative and preventative health techniques had become relatively cheap, widely available—even in remote areas—and widely accepted. If these techniques were properly promoted and utilized, it was felt, by the year 2000, it would be possible to reduce by half the number of childhood deaths (estimated at 40,000 per day) resulting from childhood immunizable diseases and dehydration from diarrhea. UNICEF's so-called "Child Survival and Development Revolution" strategy, known as GOBI-FFF, includes the use of the following four principal tools:

1. Growth Charts to detect malnutrition. These are available in 200 languages and dialects for use in some 80 countries.
2. Oral Rehydration Therapy (ORT). Diarrhea-caused dehydration is a great killer of children. A combination of sugar and salts mixed with water not only prevents dehydration, but also allows the baby to rehydrate. This work dovetails very well with UNICEF's traditional water supply and sanitation projects.
3. Breast-feeding. UNICEF promotes breast-feeding and proper weaning techniques.
4. Immunization against the six preventable childhood diseases—measles, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, polio, and tuberculosis. Better and cheaper refrigeration networks, as well as vaccines that are less susceptible to heat damage, make this program possible.

Also included in this strategy are the three Fs: Family spacing, Food production, and Female literacy.

UNICEF's approach has attracted unprecedented media attention and support from the international community, including endorsements from many world leaders. In 1985 the UN Secretary-General wrote to the Chief of State of every UN member country to call attention to the World Health Organization goal of achieving Universal Child Immunization (UCI) by 1990 and the 50 percent use of ORT by parents by 1989. In the 2 years following

his appeal, 77 countries—with over 90 percent of the developing world's children—have informed the Secretary-General of their intention to strive to achieve UCI by 1990.

UNICEF celebrated its 40th Anniversary in 1986. In its annual *State of the World's Children* report for 1987 (published in the fall of the year under review), UNICEF reaffirmed its commitment to the GOBI-FFF strategy, while emphasizing that the “real challenge” for the remainder of the 1980's and beyond “is no longer scientific or technical. It is political and social.” In this context, UNICEF will focus more attention in the next decade on organizing, mobilizing, and educating recipient countries, at the national and local levels, in an effort to create the social commitment and technical infrastructure needed to sustain the strides made through the child immunization and ORT campaigns. At the same time, UNICEF will seek ways to communicate better the needs of children in developing countries to the governments and the publics of donor countries, and keep the so-called “quiet emergencies” before the public eye.

1986 SESSION OF THE UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD

The UNICEF Executive Board held its regular annual meeting in New York, April 14-25. While continuing to endorse the goals of the Child Survival and Development Revolution, the Board expressed concern that UNICEF was becoming too “monofocal” in its emphasis on UCI and ORT. The Executive Director acknowledged this concern and outlined UNICEF's strategy for maintaining a proper balance between these so-called “vertical” campaigns on the one hand, and primary health care (PHC) programs and basic services such as water supply and sanitation on the other. He pointed out that UNICEF, by using the “twin engines” of UCI and ORT to pull along the other elements of GOBI-FFF, supporting recipient government priorities, and relying increasingly on supplementary funds for UCI and ORT campaigns, was achieving important linkages between PHC and GOBI-FFF programs and, indeed, was strengthening the infrastructure in countries for PHC. He also assured the Board that UNICEF is deeply concerned about the sustainability of programs and is working with governments to assure that the needs of children in future years will be met.

The 1986 Executive Board again voiced strong support for UNICEF's expanded program of activities in Africa. Some African Delegations expressed concern about the decline in funding to their regions and urged greater donor support. The Board also gave much encouragement to UNICEF to develop a management

strategy for its support of women in development and agreed to keep this issue as a separate agenda item at future sessions of the Board. The Board also stressed the need to strengthen program assessment and evaluation as an integral part of UNICEF's country programs.

Throughout the presentations by the UNICEF regional directors at the 1986 session of the Executive Board, the global economic decline was highlighted. UNICEF's Executive Director dwelt at some length on "economic adjustment with a human face," the concept that nutrition and other basic needs of children and other vulnerable groups should be protected while a country makes required fiscal reforms, and that social sectors—education, health, and so forth—should be restructured to make better use of available resources. In that context, UNICEF began to focus more in 1986 on encouraging household food production and security, income-generating activities for women, and low-cost community action; i.e., "social mobilization," to support the adjustment process.

The Board also reviewed the problem of children in especially difficult circumstances, including street children, exploited working children, other abused and neglected children, and children in situations of armed conflict. Noting the complexity of the issue, UNICEF's apolitical role, and the competing demands for UNICEF's limited resources, the United States and a number of countries (U.K., Sweden, Yugoslavia) urged UNICEF to take primarily an advocacy role.

The Executive Board requested the Executive Director to draft new UNICEF financial regulations for review by the Board at the 1987 session. Regarding supplementary funding, the Board reconfirmed its basic policy that such contributions would not be accepted unless the donor government remained a generous contributor to the general resources. Finally, the Executive Board approved the UNICEF medium-term plan as a framework of projections for 1986-89, including a sum of up to \$190 million in program commitments from general resources. The Board also approved total expenditure estimates of \$232.5 million for the 1986-87 biennium.

AMERICANS IN UNICEF

As of February 1987, 122 (12.7 percent), of the professional positions in UNICEF were held by Americans. Importantly, U.S. citizens occupied key policy positions including the executive directorship of UNICEF and the directorships of two out of UNICEF's six regional divisions.

UNICEF EXPENDITURES IN THE UNITED STATES

In 1986, UNICEF spent \$112.4 million in the United States. This includes \$42.9 million for supplies, freight, and other services, \$7.8 million in connection with its greeting card operation, and \$61.7 million for staff and staff-related expenses.

Human Settlement Activities

The Commission on Human Settlements was established in 1977 and consists of 58 members elected for 3-year terms. The Commission provides policy guidance to the Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT) located in Nairobi, Kenya. The United States has been a member since 1977; the permanent U.S. Representative to the Center in Nairobi is also the permanent representative to the UN Environment Program.

The Commission on Human Settlements held its ninth session in Istanbul, Turkey, May 5-16, 1986. In addition to 45 members of the Commission, observers attended representing 30 other countries. At this session, 13 UN organizations, 4 intergovernmental bodies, and 12 nongovernmental organizations, as well as several national liberation movements were represented. The U.S. Delegation was headed by Pamela Hussey, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Urban Development, Agency for International Development.

Several themes dominated the discussions at this session, including community participation, building materials, development of intermediate to long-term national shelter strategies and the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH). In an opening statement, Ms. Hussey emphasized the need to mobilize the resources of the people in a country and for governments to serve as facilitators of this process. The U.S. Delegation stated that the solution to the shelter problem lies, not in transferring increasing resources to developing countries, but rather in achieving basic institutional and policy reforms calculated to facilitate the production and financing of shelters and to manage urban growth. The five cited projects illustrated the vital role of the private sector in this area.

The United States presented a background paper that reviewed experience with community participation in five AID-financed shelter projects and offered eleven recommendations for increasing and enhancing participation in shelter and urban developments. The resolution resulting from this portion of the session urged increased efforts by governments and the United Na-

tions to facilitate popular participation through focusing on land use, indigenous building materials, financing, training, and the dissemination of relevant information. National governments were urged to encourage local administrations and to revise legislation so as to encourage community participation and nongovernmental initiative. The needs of women plus their active participation in shelter projects were recognized.

Discussion on building materials centered upon small-scale production and the use of indigenous materials. The U.S. statement emphasized the need to evaluate alternatives in the choice of materials taking account of national shelter objectives and financing priorities. A videotape was utilized describing an AID project in Ecuador in which rammed earth construction and bamboo were employed. The tenor of the discussion supported the U.S. view and urged the use of appropriate materials and technology to enhance cost recovery and facilitate self-reliance.

The Executive Director of HABITAT stated that one objective of IYSH supported the efforts of governments to identify the shelter needs of the poor and to encourage increased bilateral and multilateral assistance for shelter projects. The U.S. Delegation stressed the need to go beyond traditional approaches in order to mobilize nongovernmental resources and to deploy them efficiently so as to meet shelter and service requirements with affordable standards. The efforts of U.S. AID efforts to develop innovative financial assistance for shelter and indigenous training capacity in urban management were outlined. Projects in direct support of IYSH were described, including the preparation of a monograph on private sector roles in the provision of housing. Additional examples of U.S. efforts were development and implementation of an assessment model for housing needs, an international information campaign, and an IYSH model project competition.

In addressing national shelter strategies, the U.S. Representative proposed completion of up to three long-term national strategies as the most meaningful activity which could be undertaken to advance the goals of IYSH. One important aspect of this undertaking would be a review of donor activity in the countries chosen. The U.S. proposal was supported by the World Bank and favorably received by a number of prospective pilot countries. Ultimately, the projects were undertaken in Jamaica and Kenya. Increasing donor country interest in and support for shelter and urban development were the subject of both formal debate and informal consultations involving the United States, HABITAT, the World Bank, and several donor representatives. U.S. AID had already agreed in principle to cooperate with a UNDP/World Bank/HABITAT project on municipal management. Both the

United Kingdom and the Nordic countries are considering increased involvement which could enhance existing efforts to address these issues world-wide.

The Commission concluded its work with the adoption of 18 resolutions and one decision, all but two of them by consensus.

Population Activities

The UN Secretary-General established the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) in 1967 as a special trust fund. The Fund operates under the guidance of ECOSOC and, since 1972, with the general oversight of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNFPA is second only to the U.S. Government itself as a source of assistance for population activities in developing countries. It has an annual budget of \$140 million and finances projects in over 120 countries. The Fund is working to devote an increasing share of its resources to family planning, to confine its commitment levels to reasonable expectations, and to retain sufficient flexibility so that the assistance will be geared to the circumstances of the recipient country.

The 24th Session of the Population Commission met in February 1986. The Commission focused on priorities for future UN work and practical steps to coordinate UN population activities more effectively. Divisive political issues did not enter the debates. The 25th Session of the Commission, in 1989, will consider a proposal for an international population conference in 1994, possibly to be held in Beijing, China.

In 1985 Congress passed legislation requiring that none of the funds made available under Public Law 99-88, the supplemental appropriations bill, may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. Because of the characteristics of the PRC family planning program in the People's Republic of China and UNFPA's financial support for it, this legislation was determined to apply to UNFPA and the Administration consequently withheld \$10 million of the U.S. pledge of \$46 million for FY 1985. Since there was no significant change in the UNFPA program in the People's Republic of China or in the Chinese population program itself, the Administration did not make a contribution to the Fund for FY 1986.

The 33d session of the UNDP Governing Council was dominated by widespread concern over UNFPA's funding shortfall in

1986 and subsequent years. Numerous appeals were made for increased financial support of UNFPA, without explicit reference to the United States. The Council gave strong approval to UNFPA's current and proposed programs, with particular recognition of the special continued commitment to population assistance and readiness for cooperation with UNFPA.

The session was cordial and constructive, supportive of UNFPA's continuing role, and free of divisive debates that had hampered the sessions of 1984 and 1985. The Council readily accepted U.S. proposals for a country attribution system for UNFPA's intercountry programs, a more systematic approach to the use of evaluation findings in new program design, and clear recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations.

THE WORLD FOOD COUNCIL

The UN General Assembly created the World Food Council (WFC) pursuant to Resolution 22 of the 1974 World Food Conference. The Council has no operational functions; it offers advice and recommendations on world food and agricultural problems and policy issues. The WFC performs this function primarily through its annual ministerial session. The Council is composed of 36 members selected to represent the various regions of the world. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have been members of WFC continuously since its establishment.

WFC held its 12th Ministerial Session in Rome, Italy, June 16-19, 1986. The Council's agenda included "Africa's Transition to Food-Centered Development," "Strengthening the Council's Future Role and Program," and a review of origins of and possible solutions to instability in international food trade. The Council was addressed by FAO Director General Edouard Saouma, who called upon the Council to endorse an international pesticides code, the principle of prepositioning of food stocks, and, in light of the Chernobyl accident, radiation standards for food.

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng told the group that there were not enough public funds to meet the needs of the entire Third World. He said that Africans would have to support private enterprise if they hope to capture the necessary resources. The Ministers discussed the Anstee report (named for Assistant Secretary-General Margaret J. Anstee) on the future role of the World Food Council and came to a consensus agreement that WFC should continue to operate within its existing level of resources and terms of reference, that it should become more effec-

tive within the UN system, and that it should continue to be a political rather than an operational organization.

The United States joined in adopting the final report but entered a reservation to paragraph 3, which sought to link disarmament and development.

The WFC is headed by Gerald Trant (Canada). It has a staff of twelve professionals and a budget of \$1.8 million per year. The only U.S. citizen in the organization is Kate Newell, liaison officer for the WFC's New York City office.

Social Issues

Crime Prevention and Control

The United States joined consensus on an Italian draft resolution approved by the UN General Assembly on the subject of crime prevention and criminal justice. The resolution focused on ways and means of implementing the Milan Plan of Action. In particular, the resolution reiterated the need to review the work of the United Nations in crime prevention and criminal justice, and the need for timely preparation for the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, and invited international cooperation in the exchange of information. (Resolution 41/107)

Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

The Committee on Crime Prevention and Control held its ninth biennial session in Vienna, March 5-14, 1986. The United States was represented by its expert member, Mr. Ronald L. Gainer, Associate Deputy Attorney General. The Committee considered a broad range of issues, including UN activities in the field of crime prevention and control, review of the functioning and program of work of the United Nations in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, preparations for the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in 1990, and crime prevention and criminal justice in the context of development. The Seventh Congress met in Milan in July 1985.

The report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control in its ninth session contained four draft resolutions, and one draft decision for adoption by the First Session of the Economic and Social Council, 1986, all of which were adopted without a vote.

The first resolution dealt with "Implementation of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Seventh UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders." The resolution was amended by the Representative of the United States to insert a new preambular paragraph which underscored that the Milan Plan of Action gave priority to combating the most serious forms of transnational crimes, urged the Secretary-General to accord priority to developing specific proposals for concerted international action, and to submit such proposals to the Committee on Crime Prevention at its tenth session in 1988. (Resolution 1986/1) This omnibus resolution also considered problems relating to juvenile delinquency, justice for victims of crime, domestic violence, independence of the judiciary, prevention of arbitrary and summary executions, a code of conduct for law enforcement officials, safeguarding the rights of those facing the death penalty, alternatives to imprisonment, and the role of lawyers.

A second resolution dealt with "Initial Review of the Functioning and Programme of Work of the United Nations in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice," reaffirming the importance of the quinquennial Crime Congresses, and urged more effective use of the Crime Committee members as well as critical evaluation of methods for strengthening the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs. (Resolution 1986/2)

Another resolution considered crime prevention and criminal justice in the context of development, calling for better collection of crime-related data and called for surveys among Member States.

In connection with draft Resolutions III and IV, the Representative of the United Kingdom introduced a draft decision entitled "Report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control," which was cosponsored by the Federal Republic of Germany. It was adopted without a vote. The text reaffirmed the importance of UN activities in the field of crime prevention and control (in relation to Resolution III) and, in regard to resolution IV, requested the Secretary-General to review arrangements for the periodic congresses. The resolution also transmitted draft Resolutions III and IV for consideration to the First Session of ECOSOC, 1987, so that the Council might also consider the report of the Secretary-General. (Decision 1986/I) ECOSOC also approved the provisional agenda for the 1988 Session of the Crime Committee. (Decision 1986/II)

Drug Abuse Control

During 1986 the United States continued to support strongly the international drug control efforts of the UN system. The United States helped advance the two major drug control initiatives of the United Nations, the convening in June 1987, of the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT), and the drafting of a new international convention against drug trafficking. To assure progress in these efforts, the United States provided material and personnel resources and worked through the three UN intergovernmental bodies most involved in drug control activities—the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND), the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and the UN General Assembly (UNGA).

The U.S. helped convince other governments of the pervasive international character of the drug problem. These governments joined the United States to assure an effective international struggle against drug abuse, illicit production, and trafficking. As a result, drafting of the new convention against trafficking proceeded rapidly, and preparations continued for a productive, non-politicized international conference.

Several governments continued to devote additional resources to the fight against drug abuse; contributions increased to the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), a voluntary fund established through U.S. efforts. An American continued to serve as UNFDAC Deputy Director and, as elsewhere in the UN drug control system, efforts continued to ensure the employment of U.S. citizens at appropriate levels.

Mrs. Nancy Reagan continued to demonstrate her interest in international drug control by visiting several important East Asian countries. In addition, the involvement of the U.S. private sector, represented at the CND and at the Preparatory Conference to undertake arrangements for ICDAIT, in the UN drug agencies grew during 1986. The United Nations and the Government of Sweden cosponsored international meeting to facilitate the involvement of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in ICDAIT. The United States supported the participation of many U.S. NGOs at this meeting.

The 41st UN General Assembly gave considerable attention to the ICDAIT and the new convention. Both initiatives received broad support during the general debate on drug abuse. Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotic Matters, Ann B. Wroblewski (who replaced Jon R. Thomas), delivered a strong intervention which helped set the cooperative tone of the debate and

noted the extent to which all governments recognized the extent of the drug problem. Secretary Wroblewski stated: "Our response to the drug crisis has become truly international. When nations work together to solve a problem which affects all nations, chances for success are greater. We are seeing such success on many fronts at the regional level."

During the Assembly, the U.S. Delegation joined in an unusual negotiating group which crossed customary voting bloc divisions. This group achieved consensus on the UNGA Resolutions concerning the ICDAIT and the new convention. It set the stage for a noncontentious world conference expected to operate on the basis of full consensus without the bloc voting and negotiating patterns seen at previous conferences. The United States pursued this objective in the hope that a unified conference on drug abuse would serve as a precedent for future UN conferences.

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

The Ninth Special Session of the 40-member Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND)* convened in Vienna on February 10-14. Jon R. Thomas, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotic matters, led the U.S. delegation which included representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, Health and Human Services, and Treasury (the U.S. Customs Service). Congressman Benjamin A. Gilman delivered a major U.S. statement to the Commission. The CND approved two draft resolutions for consideration by the Economic and Social Council, adopted three resolutions by consensus, and made twenty decisions.

The United States is regularly elected to CND membership for four-year terms.

Draft Convention Against Drug Trafficking

The CND had as its major item of business the consideration of comments and proposals from governments concerning a draft convention on illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. As called for in UNGA Resolution 40/120, the CND proceeded to discuss these proposals and to decide on elements or a draft convention. The CND also determined the modalities

*Members in 1986 were: (Terms expire December 1987) Algeria, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iran, Italy, Madagascar, Morocco, The Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United States, Yugoslavia (Terms expire December 1989) Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Ecuador, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, Soviet Union, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zambia.

which would be used to refine the draft further. All the priority elements proposed by the United States appeared in the largely U.S.-drafted resolution entitled "Guidance on the Drafting of an International Convention to Combat Drug Trafficking." The resolution passed by consensus, with sponsorship from every region. Following the CND, the United States played a key role in the drafting of the convention by providing to the UN Division of Narcotic Drugs expert advisors and other technical assistance.

ECOSOC endorsed the progress made during 1986 on the drafting of the convention. The 41st UNGA reemphasized the need for rapid completion of the draft convention, and requested the 1987 CND to reach agreement on draft language so that ratification of the convention could occur on a timely basis. Considering the complexity of drafting a new convention, observers noted the remarkable progress made on this high priority endeavor during 1986. The Department of Justice, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Department of State, and several other U.S. agencies cooperated to make this possible.

Control of Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking and Production

The UN Drug Control Agencies during 1986 undertook many actions to combat all aspects of the drug problem. The Division of Narcotic Drugs (DND) sponsored law enforcement training seminars, demand reduction training and other related activities. The International Narcotics Control Board continued to monitor the movement of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances as required by the two existing treaties in force. The ECOSOC reelected an American, Ms. Betty Gough, to a new five-year term on the Board.

The UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control had a particularly active year. It maintained and expanded its international program of national and regional activities to combat trafficking and to reduce production and consumption of illicit narcotic and psychotropic substances. The Andean countries began to prepare master plans for the eradication and control of illicit drugs under UNFDAC's guidance. Increasingly, the United States coordinated its drug control activities with those of UNFDAC. The pledges contributions for 1986 totaled \$16,970,338 of which the United States pledged 3 million dollars. Italy made the largest contribution of \$4,353,363.

ECOSOC endorsed two resolutions forwarded by the CND. One called for greater balance between the demand for and the supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs. The other, drafted by the United States, called for the strengthening of the

control of international trade in secobarbital, a psychotropic substance listed in Schedule III of the 1971 Convention.

In addition to providing guidance on the drafting of the new convention, the CND commended the World Health Organization (in a U.S.-drafted resolution) for the improvement of its procedures for the review of dependence-producing psychotropic substances for international control under the international drug control conventions. In the area of the control of licitly produced drugs, the CND adopted a resolution on the exemption of preparations from control under the 1971 Convention. This resolution clarified actions governments should take regarding exempted preparations. The CND also decided to ask UNFDAC to help governments in identifying illicit opium poppy cultivation in the geographic area covered by the CND's Near and Middle East Sub-Commission. Finally, the CND approved the agenda for an Inter-regional Meeting of the Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies (HONLEA), which was held in August 1986. This meeting examined in depth the most important aspects of the drug trafficking problem and served as a preparatory meeting for the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking.

Drug Scheduling

The CND meeting in February has as one goal the placing of international controls on 17 psychotropic substances. Seven substances were included in Schedule 1 of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances: cathinone, 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (DMA), paramethoxyamphetamine (PMA), 3,4,5-trimethoxyamphetamine (TMA), 2,5-dimethoxy-4-ethylamphetamine (DOET), 5-methoxy-3,4-methylenedioxyamphetamine (MMDA), and 3,4-methylenedioxy-methamphetamine (MDMA). Four substances were placed in Schedule II of the Psychotropic convention: cathine, fenetylline, levamphetamine, and levomethamphetamine. Six substances were placed in Schedule IV: N-ethylamphetamine, fencamfamin, fenproporex, mefenorex, propylhexedrine and pyrovalerone.

The United States made clear during the CND that insufficient data existed on abuse of and illicit traffic in propylhexedrine and pyrovalerone to warrant the controls imposed by scheduling. Later in 1986, therefore, the United States requested that WHO reconsider these two substances and make a new recommendation to the CND so that the level of control would more accurately reflect the actual risk of these substances.

International Narcotics Control Board

The 1986 Report of the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) provided a reasoned and thoughtful assessment of the international drug abuse, trafficking, and production situation. Though well received, some countries implied that the report's honesty made it awkward for them to continue to deny problems with illicit production.

In introducing the report, Betty Gough, the President of the International Narcotics Control Board, stated that the abuse of a variety of drugs remained at a high level, and in some countries had escalated, creating major public health problems. Multiple drug use, frequently in combination with alcohol, new and more potent drugs, and more dangerous means of drug-taking, all compounded the problems. The prospects for further deterioration were ominous. A growing number of States encountered illicit cultivation and production of drugs. In some regions a close connection existed between drug trafficking and other major criminal activity. The Board believed this tended to undermine the economic and social order, to spread violence and corruption, and in some cases to jeopardize national political security and stability.

The Board noted, nevertheless, that the adoption of vigorous countermeasures on the part of governments had resulted in some progress. This applied to, *inter alia*, joint enforcement operations, including the eradication of illicit cultivation, and the imposition of tighter controls on chemicals and solvents for illicit manufacture, notably of heroin and cocaine. The Board welcomed proposals to facilitate extradition and to strengthen legislation to ensure the seizure of traffickers' illicitly acquired assets and endorsed the preparation of the new anti-trafficking convention. The Board also welcomed the growing involvement of public and community leaders in preventing and reducing drug abuse and a number of new initiatives to fight all aspects of drug abuse adopted over the previous two years. An expansion in the number of Parties to the 1961 and 1971 Conventions accompanied these initiatives. With adherence to the former Convention now nearly universal, the Board hoped that universal adherence to the international regime for psychotropic substances would follow.

The Board noted again that the problem of "designer drugs" had grown. The Board President stated that international action might be necessary to prevent clandestine manufacture and abuse of these controlled substance analogues on a widespread basis.

UN FUND FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

During the CND Session, the Executive Director of UNFDAC, Dr. Giuseppe di Gennaro (Italy), outlined UNFDAC's program development and fundraising activities. UNFDAC provided financial assistance for the formulation and implementation of 50 projects in 25 countries. He said the substantial growth in UNFDAC's resources, the numerous requests for its assistance, and the continuous expansion of its activities indicated worldwide recognition of the important role played by the Fund.

The Deputy Executive Director of the Fund, William Beachner, an American, said that financial assistance had been matched by the political will and dedication of countries in need, thereby strengthening the capacity of the international community to cope with drug abuse problems. The United States pledged almost \$3 million to UNFDAC in 1986. This figure represented a sizeable portion of UNFDAC's 1986 pledges, and the United States continued as the largest overall contributor to the Fund. The Fund remained a key element in the struggle against all aspects of the drug problem.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DRUG ABUSE AND ILLICIT TRAFFICKING (ICDAIT)

As agreed by the 40th UNGA, the CND met for an additional week in February 1986, to serve as the preparatory body for the ICDAIT. This first Preparatory Conference (Prepcon) was largely uncontentious and successful. The success and effectiveness of the conference remained high priorities for the United States. The U.S. Government provided considerable personnel and financial resources to the UN Secretariat to help assure adequate Conference preparations. The major U.S. objectives for the Conference included:

- obtaining the declared commitment by political level representatives of all governments to take effective measures to reduce illicit drug production, trafficking, and abuse;

- assuring appropriate media attention to increase public awareness of the international character of the problem and generate support for drug control activities;

- assuring that the Conference while focusing on difficult substantive issues such as drug trafficking and terrorism, does not become politicized;

- obtaining expressions of support for the work of the UN drug agencies, especially the International Narcotic Control Board and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, and for the

international drug control treaties including the draft convention on drug trafficking;

—assure that appropriate technical expertise concerning the reduction of production, trafficking and demand is shared among participants to help generate effective action and international co-ordination following the Conference.

A U.S. Secretariat for ICDAIT was established to coordinate activities related to the Conference, and to support the U.S. Delegation before and during the Conference. F. Gray Handley of the Department of State was named Coordinator of the Secretariat. The Secretariat receives policy guidance from the Department of State and the other relevant agencies.

The First Preparatory Conference slightly amended and endorsed the draft agenda for the Conference. It adopted the draft rules of procedure for the Conference with strengthened language, put forward by the United States, urging that all Conference decisions be by consensus. This was expected to help avoid the politicization present at previous UN-sponsored world conferences.

The UN Secretariat was instructed to prepare a "Comprehensive Multi-Disciplinary Outline of Future Activities in Drug Abuse Control" (CMO) based on contributions from governments, technical experts, NGO's, and UN agencies. The draft CMO was to be considered at the second Prepcon in February 1987. This Outline, one of the main products of the conference, was to be a practical compendium of what governments could do individually and collectively to address problems of drug abuse, trafficking, and production. The clear sense of the Prepcon was that the attention of the world conference should be balanced between demand reduction and supply reduction. The important role of nongovernmental organizations and the UN system also would be recognized. The only other document expected from the Conference was a "Declaration" of the political will of governments to take individual and collective action.

Observers noted that the first ICDAIT Prepcon avoided divisive regional political issues that were unrelated to drug control. No evidence of politicization emerged, countries from all regions spoke in opposition to any politicization of the Conference. Many noted the opportunity the Conference offered for unified action within the UN setting. Several strong U.S. interventions on substantive and organizational aspects of the conference set the cooperative tone for the proceedings. Behind the scenes, the U.S. Delegation made special efforts to enlist broad support for all Prepcon decisions based on shared technical concerns. At U.S. initiative, the Prepcon avoided any resolutions. Its consensus decisions were

recorded in the report of the Prepcon which, in turn, the ECOSOC and GA fully endorsed.

During 1986 the UN Secretariat implemented the Prepcon recommendations. The draft CMO was prepared and distributed to governments for comment and review at the second Prepcon, scheduled for February 1987. An early draft of the political declaration was considered by delegations on the margins of the 41st UNGA. This was accomplished through an informal, interregional, open-ended working group under the chairmanship of the Malaysian Delegation to the UN. In all preparations for ICDAIT, this somewhat unusual intergovernmental working group proved a useful mechanism which avoided regional divisions. The United States continued to encourage its use through the Conference itself to further assure a successful result.

Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator (UNDRO)

Problems of uncoordinated relief efforts in a series of major disasters in the late 1960's convinced members of the United Nations that a distinct office was needed to help organize the emergency assistance which individual governments, UN agencies, the Red Cross, and other voluntary societies provide. In March 1972, the United Nations Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO) was established to mobilize relief more rapidly; coordinate it more systematically; and reduce waste, duplication, and failure in the supply of essential items. UNDRO was also given responsibility for improving contingency planning and disaster preparedness worldwide and for harnessing modern scientific and technological knowledge to prevent and mitigate disasters.

Under Secretary-General M'Hamed Essaafi of Tunisia currently leads UNDRO. UNDRO's mandate is three-fold: to mobilize, direct and coordinate relief activities among organizations of the UN system; to assist governments of stricken countries to assess relief needs, disseminate that information, and coordinate the donors' response; and to promote disaster prevention and preparedness activities. Disaster relief coordination is the core of the activities of UNDRO and receives the highest priority in the allocation of resources. UNDRO was active in 1986 in coordinating relief efforts in many countries stricken by man-made and natural disasters, including:

—Lebanon, South Yemen, Haiti, Algeria, Mozambique, Angola, Chad, Sudan, Ethiopia (armed conflict/displaced persons)

- Sudan, Ethiopia (drought, famine)
- Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, Jamaica, China, Bangladesh, and Fiji/Tonga (floods)
- Philippines, Solomon Islands, Korea, Viet Nam (cyclones/typhoons)
- Sri Lanka (dam burst)
- Burma (fires)
- El Salvador, Brazil, Greece (earthquakes)
- Nigeria (epidemic)

UNDRO, which in 1977 had signed a memorandum of understanding with the International Atomic Energy Agency, also assisted in gathering and disseminating information in the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear accident in April 1986.

In 1984–85, the widespread emergency situation in Africa involving 18 countries and an estimated 30 million people had dominated UNDRO's activities. Senior staff members from UNDRO supported the UN Office for Emergency Operations in Africa (OEOA), an exceptional and temporary mechanism established by the Secretary-General, while continuing to carry out the functions falling under UNDRO's own mandate. UNDRO cooperated closely with many organizations in the UN system and other intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations involved in humanitarian relief. UNDRO established and reinforced national focal points for disaster management information. For example, in the Sudan and Chad, units were created to serve government relief committees and individual donors in the collection, recording, analysis, and dissemination of information on the emergency situation.

UNDRO continued in 1986 its wide-ranging coordination activities on the African continent. When Mozambique, Angola, and Chad suffered serious casualties and material damages from situations of armed conflict, UNDRO assessed emergency relief needs and coordinated international relief efforts. In drought-stricken Sudan and Ethiopia, UNDRO continued to assist the OEOA in coordinating disaster relief assistance. UNDRO was helpful in gathering and disseminating information and assessing assistance needs in Cameroon in the wake of the Lake Nyos disaster in August. UNDRO also cooperated with the Food and Agriculture Organization in the rapid dissemination of information on locust and grasshopper infestations threatening large areas of Africa.

In the areas of disaster prevention and preparedness, UNDRO participated in and cosponsored studies, seminars, and projects concerning vulnerability assessments, disaster prevention and preparedness in Arab countries, post-disaster evaluation for

the Pacific Island countries, and earthquake prediction and mitigation.

REFORM OF UNDRO

UNDRO reached a crossroads during the year under review. Several governments, including the United States, concluded that UNDRO had "not lived up to its potential." Positive steps taken by UNDRO in the last five years had not solved its basic problems of lack of credibility in the eyes of many donor nations and lack of authority within the UN system itself. These problems were manifested by the perception of ineffective performance in the recent major relief efforts following the Mexico City and El Salvador earthquakes and the volcanic eruption in Colombia. The report by the Group of 18 High-Level Experts, recommending numerous reforms to improve UN efficiency, suggested that the UN Development Program (UNDP) "consider the feasibility of taking over the functions currently performed by UNDRO" (Recommendation 24). In its report on the G-18 report, however, the UNGA Fifth Committee (Administration and Finance), cited the "different nature and functions of UNDRO and UNDP." The 41st UNGA also adopted by consensus a resolution noting the "distinct character" of emergency relief and development aid and the "different nature and functions" of UNDRO and UNDP. (Resolution 41/201) Ultimately, the Secretary-General must decide the future course of UNDRO, based on evaluation of the G-18's recommendation and perhaps recommendations from member countries.

UN High Commissioner For Refugees

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), organized in 1951, is mandated to provide legal protection and material assistance to refugees and to promote permanent solutions for refugee problems. These responsibilities are carried out on behalf of refugees falling within the scope of the Statute of the Office adopted by the General Assembly in 1950. In general, the Statute applies to those persons who are outside their country of nationality because they have a well-founded fear of persecution by reason of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion and, because of such fear, are unable or unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of the government of that country. The term of the current High Commissioner, Jean-Pierre Hocke (Switzerland), expires December 31, 1988.

The Executive Committee of the UNHCR meets annually in Geneva to review the work of the UNHCR and approve the budget. At this meeting, the UNHCR advises the Executive Committee on any special activities. The U.S. Representative at the 37th Session of the Executive Committee, held October 7-16, 1986, was Mr. Jonathan Moore, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Ambassador-at-Large.

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL PROTECTION

The basic legal mechanisms for the protection of refugees are the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which is restricted to persons who became refugees as a result of events occurring before 1951, and the 1967 Protocol, which removes the time limit on eligibility. The United States is a party to the Protocol. States acceding to these international instruments accept provisions explicitly prohibiting the return of a refugee, in any manner whatsoever, to any country in which his life or freedom would be threatened because of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. At the same time, however, the refugee has obligations to the country in which he finds himself and is required to conform to its laws and regulations as well as to the measures taken for the maintenance of public order.

The international protection of refugees includes ensuring that they are granted (political) asylum, that those who wish to return voluntarily to their country of origin may do so without penalty for having fled, and that no refugee is forcibly returned to his/her country of origin. The UNHCR also is concerned with providing basic care and maintenance for refugees, including meeting emergency needs, and with protecting the refugees' right to work, to practice their religion, and to receive social benefits under the law.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Jean-Pierre Hocke (Swiss), delivered his first statement as High Commissioner to the Third Committee on November 7, 1986. His statement highlighted: UNHCR accountability to the international community in fulfilling its mandate in an effective, neutral, and efficient manner; refugees as a global phenomenon, often inseparable from the range of problems affecting political, social, cultural, and economic development; the movement of asylum-seekers from developing nations to the industrialized world which has

prompted Governments to react with policies determined by the imperatives of deterrence; and the problem of forced exile which requires a common approach and joint efforts to identify possible solutions. In handling the problems of the world's refugees he said UNHCR must proceed along two lines of action: first, to react to existing and new refugee crises with an approach that combines effective emergency response, the prompt establishment of basic services (health, sanitation, education), and early action in respect of income-generating activities; and second, a systematic and dynamic search for solutions to end the problem. In terms of solutions he placed highest priority on voluntary repatriation. Where repatriation is not possible, he would attach equal importance to the three other solutions: local integration in the country of first asylum, resettlement, and until one of these is viable, a degree of self-reliance in the countries of first asylum. Mr. Hocke reinforced the important connection between refugee aid and development. Regarding his efforts to reorganize UNHCR's structure he said the following: "In order to attain these goals I have sought to reorganize UNHCR's structure in a manner that would enhance its effectiveness. I have concentrated on what I consider essential to improve delivery of our programmes and services to the field: the assessment of refugee needs, the establishment of budgets, the control of programme implementation and the preparation of reports for internal and external use. I intend to continue to explore, in consultation with the Executive Committee, all ways of making UNHCR a more field-based, performance-oriented, better technically-equipped organization."

In closing, he concluded: "I believe the one basic right which the world's refugees should not be denied is the right to have their interests protected, defended and promoted by an efficient, committed, and capable organization that has the universal support of the international community. In that sense I do hope that the tradition of support to resolutions of the Committee regarding UNHCR's actions will continue to prevail."

Nine draft resolutions on refugee-related matters were introduced in the Third Committee, eight of which related to refugees in Africa. Of these, six were adopted by consensus: (L.46) "Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa" introduced by Cameroon (Resolution 41/122), (L.48) "Assistance to Student Refugees in Southern Africa" introduced by Botswana (Resolution 41/136), (L. 50) "Humanitarian Assistance to Refugees in Djibouti" (Resolution 41/137), (L.52) "Assistance to Refugees in Somalia" (Resolution 41/138), (L.53) "Situation of Refugees in the Sudan" (Resolution 41/139), and (L.54) "Emergency Assistance to returnees and displaced persons in Chad." (Resolution 41/140)

At the demand of the countries involved, the African Group requested that action on four of these resolutions (L.50, L.52, L.53 and L.54) be taken as a block and they were adopted by consensus on November 21, 1986, with the United States as a cosponsor to one (L.53). The United States found it difficult to cosponsor all these resolutions mainly because they did not take changing conditions in Africa into account and they tended to confuse the role of UNHCR and other UN bodies such as UNDRO. The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, explained U.S. reservations to consensus resolutions as follows:

Prompted by empathy for the plight of those suffering in Africa, the United States has joined consensus of resolutions L.50, L.52, and L.54. We do, however, have reservations on these three resolutions. Our reservations lie in the fact that the situation in Africa has changed since last year. We believe that the resolutions should reflect that change. While there are persistent problems created by large refugee populations, this committee should acknowledge that the drought is largely over, that new flows of refugees have decreased, and that famine conditions have substantially subsided. In fact, it appears that many of the food shortages are primarily the result of uncertainty about the number of people in need of assistance. Resolutions that accurately reflect the situation could propose measures which we believe would better meet current needs.

Some of the resolutions call for interagency missions. Such missions can only repeat work that has already been done. There is no reason that there cannot be interagency cooperation carried out from agency headquarters and undertaken by the agency field representatives and UNHCR officers. Further, interagency missions could accomplish very little if no background work is undertaken by governments to help integrate refugee-related and national development programs.

Mr. Chairman, we have also noted a tendency to confuse the role of the UNHCR and other UN agencies. It should be stressed that the UNHCR can only handle refugees within the approved definition of the term, and assist in the resettlement of refugees voluntarily returning to their countries of origin. Displaced people and disaster victims should be handled by other agencies such as UNDRO. Some of these resolutions request that reports be made to the General Assembly. We consider that such reports would be more useful if presented directly to the Executive Committee of the UNHCR.

The United States voted against two of the eight resolutions dealing with refugees: (L.47) "Measures of Assistance Provided to South African and Namibian Refugee Women and Children" (Resolution 41/123) and (L.55) "Assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia." (Resolution 41/141) Regarding Resolution 41/123, which was passed by a vote of 147 in favor, 1 against (U.S.), and 8 abstentions, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, provided the following explanation of vote on November 19, 1986:

Mr. Chairman, the United States regrets that it could not join consensus or vote in favor of Resolution L.47 (Measures of Assistance Provided to South

African and Namibian Refugee Women and Children). The current wording of this resolution is so politicized that it can only hurt those it means to assist. We regret that the cosponsors of this resolution could not find a formulation leading to a consensus on an issue so vital as assistance to a group as vulnerable as women and children.

At the request of the United States, a vote was called on (L.55) "Assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia." (Resolution 41/141) The resolution was passed by 150 yes to 1 no (U.S.) and 1 abstention. Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne provided the following explanation of vote:

Concerning Resolution L.55, Assistance to Displaced Persons in Ethiopia, my delegation has voted against this resolution not only because of the reasons outlined above, but also because as the distinguished delegate of Ethiopia himself pointed out to this Assembly on Wednesday, November 19th, the United States believes that there should be a distinction between the government and people of Ethiopia. While we do not wish our negative vote to indicate a slackening of efforts in assistance to the suffering people of Ethiopia, we also do not wish to indicate support for the policies of the government of Ethiopia. These policies in fact lead to a loss of lives and human rights, cause flight across international boundaries, and force the internal migrations of Ethiopian citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the country of origin in the Horn of Africa cannot be treated on a par with the countries of asylum that are to host over a million refugees. Further, although the international community willingly assists victims of natural drought and famine, it can only be expected to assist the victims of manmade disasters when the responsible government themselves correct the causes of these disasters.

To those who would attempt to misconstrue our vote in any way, I wish categorically to state here and now that a no vote does not show a lack of humanitarian ideals; on the contrary, it shows an interest in highlighting the truth in this Assembly and in bettering the lot of the suffering people of Ethiopia. The U.S. position on this is clear because the United States remains a major donor to the suffering people of Ethiopia. While others may provide signatures, cosponsorships, and votes, the government and people of the United States provide tangible assistance to the refugees, displaced persons, and others suffering in Ethiopia. I sincerely regret, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished delegate of Ethiopia publicly announced his refusal to help find language that would accommodate our concerns about this resolution.

Although the United States was isolated on the outcome as the only country to vote against the resolution, the United States forcefully made its point on the truth of the Ethiopian situation. Furthermore, the stage has been set for a more realistic approach to African refugee resolutions next year.

Sweden introduced a draft resolution (L.56) on the "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" (Resolution 41/124) which was adopted by consensus. In joining consensus, the U.S. Representative provided the following explanation:

Mr. Chairman, on another issue, resolution L.56 on the UNHCR, the United States has joined consensus on the understanding that the condemnation in operative paragraph 4 of all violations of the rights and safety of refu-

gees and asylum-seekers, in particular those perpetrated by military or armed attacks against refugee camps and settlements, is a condemnation of attacks on camps and settlements that are in violation of international law governing the use of force. The United States' support of the resolution should not be construed as support for the proposition that it is unlawful under any circumstances to use force against a refugee camp or settlement, even if it is being used in a manner inconsistent with its civilian purpose. As the United States has consistently maintained during meetings of the UNHCR Executive Committee in Geneva, this proposition clearly contradicts the principle of self-defense contained in article 51 of the charter and reflected in other international instruments.

Two decisions were adopted on Reports of the Third Committee. Regarding the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the General Assembly, on recommendation of the Third Committee, took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the role of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees in Africa and of the comments of the Secretary-General on that report. (Resolution 41/427) And, at the request of Denmark, action on its draft resolution "International Procedures for the Protection of Refugees" was deferred until the 42d Session of the General Assembly in order to permit consultations to be held. (Resolution 41/428)

In Fifth Committee, Ambassador Joseph V. Reed, Alternate United States Representative to the 41st Session of the UNGA, addressed Item 109, Board of Auditors Reports in his statement on October 1, 1986:

At the 40th Session of the General Assembly, the United States Delegation devoted considerable attention in its statement on this agenda item to the audit report on UNHCR. In the light of the serious weakness identified by the Board of Auditors and the Joint Inspection Unit, my delegation called upon UNHCR management to take immediate and clearly stated actions to improve budgetary controls, cash management, compliance with procurement procedures and management of project activities. In this regard, we are gratified that the new High Commissioner has taken steps to analyze UNHCR operations both at headquarters and in the field. We hope the studies currently underway will lead to improvements in management control systems.

UNHCR PROGRAMS

In 1986 UNHCR expenditures for refugee aid throughout the world reached a total of \$448.24 million. This total included expenditures for overall allocations and Global Programs in the amount of \$47 million which is not reflected in the expenditures indicated below by geographic region. The United States contributed \$105.5 million (23.9 percent) in support of UNHCR assistance programs.

The UNHCR Emergency Operations Unit is continuing the process of systematically upgrading its worldwide institutional

preparedness for anticipating and responding to emergencies. In FY 1986 the United States contributed \$300,000 toward this effort to provide UNHCR officers with intensive training in emergency preparedness and contingency planning.

Africa

UNHCR expenditures for programs in Africa totaled \$196.1 million in 1986; \$91.5 million under General Programs, and \$104.6 million under Special Programs. The largest UNHCR programs were in Sudan, Ethiopia, and Somalia. The United States contributed \$45.4 million toward these programs.

Asia

In 1986 UNHCR expenditures to assist refugees in Asia totaled \$72.14 million; \$63.07 under the General Program and \$9.07 under Special Programs. The largest portion of UNHCR expenditures in this region was for the care of Indochinese refugees in Southeast Asian countries of first asylum. The United States contributed \$17.68 million toward these UNHCR care and maintenance programs.

At the end of 1986, 161,557 refugees occupied UNHCR-supervised camps, compared to 175,983 at the end of 1985. During 1986, 64,567 Indochinese refugees were resettled abroad, including 36,954 in the United States.

UNHCR continued to pursue other solutions to the Indochinese refugee problem in Southeast Asia, such as voluntary repatriation, when possible, and the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), by which asylum seekers emigrate legally from Vietnam. In the past year, 8,500 Vietnamese used the ODP to rejoin relatives in the United States; and another 8,891 were resettled through the ODP in other countries. The United States contributed \$550,000 toward the UNHCR administrative costs of this ODP program. During 1986, 270 refugees in first asylum countries were either voluntarily repatriated or permanently relocated.

In 1986 the United States contributed \$1,469,760 million in support of the UNHCR and Royal Thai Government cooperative program to combat pirates' attacks on Vietnamese boat refugees in the Gulf of Thailand, and for other rescue-at-sea activities.

Europe and North America

During 1986 UNHCR expenditures for programs to assist refugees in Europe and North America were \$16.5 million. UNHCR programs in Europe primarily assist refugees in transit and those

refugees who are awaiting repatriation or permanent resettlement. UNHCR assistance activities in North America are primarily related to counseling services on legal and resettlement issues. In 1986 no U.S. funding was provided in support of these programs.

Latin America

UNHCR expenditures for programs in Latin America in 1986 were \$49.9 million, with its largest programs in Honduras, Mexico, and Costa Rica. The United States contributed \$11.4 million toward UNHCR assistance programs in this region.

Southwest Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East

In 1986 UNHCR expenditure for programs in this region totaled \$86.5 million. The largest program in the region, the relief effort for over two million Afghans in Pakistan, provides food, shelter, health services, education, and vocational training for the largest refugee population in any country of the world. UNHCR is the lead agency in this major international relief program which supports the Government of Pakistan's efforts to meet the basic needs of these refugees. Since 1984, in conjunction with the World Bank, UNHCR has focused attention on the importance of increasing the Afghans' self-sufficiency as a means of decreasing the burden they pose for the Government of Pakistan and the international community. The World Bank, in conjunction with the UNHCR, has initiated a series of projects designed to provide refugees with employment opportunities, thus freeing them from dependency on camp life in an asylum country. The United States contributed \$15 million to UNHCR for its Afghan refugee assistance program. A U.S. contribution of \$10 million supported UNHCR programs in Cyprus.

International Cooperation to Avert New Flows of Refugees

This item, on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1980, was first included at the request of the Federal Republic of Germany. This initiative was supported by the United States and other Western, African, and Asian countries who have provided assistance to refugees in the interest of arriving at some concrete measures that could be taken by member states and the UN

system to help ameliorate conditions that may lead to new massive flows of refugees.

A Group of International Experts to Develop Recommendations on International Cooperation to Avert New Flows of Refugees was established in 1981. The Expert Group consisted of members from 24 countries* in 1986, including the United States.

In accordance with the program of work agreed by the group at its first session, the Group of Experts concluded its analysis of causes and factors which could lead to mass refugee flows and the question of appropriate means to avert new flows. The group was able to agree on several steps and measures to avert new massive flow of refugees that could be taken by both Member States and the UN system and forwarded these recommendations to the General Assembly for discussion at its 41st session.

The Special Political Committee considered item 76, "International Cooperation to Avert New Flows of Refugees," on October 10, 13, and 14. A draft resolution subsequently cosponsored by 29 countries adopted the conclusions and recommendations of the Group of Experts. This resolution was adopted by the SPC on October 14 without a vote. On December 3, the General Assembly adopted Resolution 41/70 without a vote.

AGING

At the 41st Session of the UNGA a Resolution 41/96 entitled "Question of Aging" was adopted without a vote. Another resolution introduced by the Dominican Republic and cosponsored by the United States entitled "Implementation of the International Plan of Action on Aging" was deferred until the 42d UNGA with the agreement of the cosponsors. This resolution proposed that two separate trust funds for the aging be merged into a single fund to be administered by the UNDP.

This proposal was not acceptable to the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) or to many G-77 members who felt the UN Trust Fund for the Aging should be maintained within the Vienna-based UN Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs (CSDHA) according to current arrangements. Speaking in explanation of vote in the Third Committee, U.S. Representative Patricia M. Byrne said the United States contin-

*Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Djibouti, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Honduras, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, U.S.S.R., the United States, and Vietnam. During 1986 the Group of Experts held its seventh and eighth sessions during which it concluded its report to the General Assembly as requested in 1981. The United States was represented by John M. Herzberg.

ues to support the merger of the two trust funds for the aging under the administration of UNDP because this arrangement would increase the likelihood of voluntary support of aging activities and put such activities in the mainstream of UN technical co-operation programs.

DISABLED

The United States is a traditional cosponsor of the resolutions on the disabled adopted by the UNGA. At the First Session of ECOSOC in 1986 the United States introduced a resolution on the disabled which was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 1986/16) As a followup, the United States intended to introduce a resolution at the 41st UNGA, but did not after our draft encountered widespread opposition. Again, as was the case with the Dominican Republic's draft resolution's provisions for the Trust Fund on the aging, the idea of transferring the administration of the Voluntary Fund for the Decade for Disabled Persons from the CSDHA in Vienna, to the UNDP in New York, was not supported. After lengthy negotiations, the United States decided not to introduce its draft, and joined consensus in adopting an alternative draft resolution introduced by Belgium. (Resolution 41/106)

YOUTH

The UNGA Third Committee devoted seven sessions to debate youth related issues, along with other social issues, under Item 86 of its agenda: Policies and Programs Involving Young People: Participation, Development, Peace. Three resolutions concerning youth were adopted without a vote. One of which, on the appropriate followup for International Youth Year which concluded December 31, 1985, was cosponsored by the United States, were adopted without a vote. (Resolutions 41/97, 41/98, 41/99)

United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)

The idea of UNEP grew out of a recommendation by the UN Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm, June 1972), that a UN body be formed to catalyze and coordinate environmental activities by governments and throughout the UN system. Late that year, UNEP was established by UN General Assembly Resolution 2997.

Headquartered in Nairobi, Kenya, UNEP was the first UN program to be based in a developing country. It operates under

the oversight and policy guidance of a Governing Council (GC)* which reports to the General Assembly through the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The 58 Governing Council members, serving 3 year terms, are comprised of 16 African, 13 Asian, 10 Latin American, 13 Western European, and Other (including the United States), and 6 Eastern European nations. Dr. Mostafa Tolba (Egypt) has been the Executive Director of UNEP since 1976; his current term expires in 1988.

As of the end of 1986, the Secretariat employed 161 professionals of whom 15 were U.S. citizens.

UNEP's budget consists of two parts, one paid out of United Nations assessments and the other an Environment Fund financed by voluntary governmental contributions. In 1986 the assessed portion was \$5 million. The 1986 voluntary contributions totaled \$29.1 million, of which the United States provided \$8.6 million, or 29.5 percent. The proposed voluntary budget for 1986/87 is \$26.2 million.

While the United States continues to support UNEP and to place high value on many of its programs, in October 1986, the FY 1987 U.S. voluntary contribution was reduced to \$6.8 million, or 22.6 percent of the projected total resources of the Environment Fund because of budget cuts mandated by P.L. 99-500.

UNEP catalyzes, coordinates, and promotes participation by governments and international organizations in national and international efforts to preserve and enhance the environment and natural resource base. It seeks to help all countries in dealing with environmental problems, and in seeking financial resources to provide technical assistance, education, training, information, and exchange of experience. UNEP provides a source of added knowledge for integrated biospheric resource management and for safeguarding human well-being as well as that of ecosystems. In particular, UNEP encourages and supports rational planning and management of development, including that of natural resources, which takes environmental consequences into account so as to achieve maximum social, economic, and environmental benefits.

More specifically, following are several UNEP programs of particular importance to the United States, and in which significant progress was achieved in 1986:

*Members in 1986 were: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

—The Global Environment Monitoring Systems (GEMS) assembles and disseminates environmental and natural resource data and information on a global basis, while, at relatively low cost, filling gaps in existing monitoring programs. It also provides technical assistance to developing countries in designing low-cost monitoring systems and standardizing data from existing monitoring programs so that more countries can derive benefit from environmental information. GEMS maintains active and close cooperation with both the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). GEMS, and particularly its component program the Global Resource Information Database (GRID), which uses skilled personnel and space-based technology made available by NASA, expanded appreciably in 1986.

—The International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals (IRPTC) maintains a legal file on national chemical regulations and provides this national regulatory information to governments and other subscribers. The legal file is aimed especially at developing country users who may lack sufficient expertise and may require this information to improve their own regulatory infrastructure with respect to economically important chemicals, particularly pesticides. In addition, IRPTC coordinates a network of “designated national authorities” who exchange information on national control actions and on export and import of specific banned or severely restricted chemicals.

—Under the Environmental Law Program considerable progress was made in negotiation of a protocol to the 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer on control of ozone-depleting substances, especially chlorofluorocarbons. The United States took a leadership role in these negotiations, which, at year's end, had a reasonable chance to succeed.

—The Regional Seas Program was initiated by UNEP in 1974. To date, it has promoted the development of environmental action plans for 11 maritime regions with over 120 coastal states participating. Each regional action plan is formulated by the governments concerned, and designed to identify significant marine and coastal environmental problems and coordinate parallel plans of action among participating countries.

The United States has particular interest in two regional seas projects, those for the Caribbean and the South Pacific, which directly affect U.S. territory. In November 1986, the United States joined with six other governments in signing the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region. This action culminated a 3-year negotiating

process, funded in part by UNEP. In addition, UNEP advises and supports the South Pacific Regional Environment Program, to which AID contributes through its support of the South Pacific Commission.

In the Caribbean, the ninth ratification (which includes the United States) was deposited in December 1986 for the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region and Protocol on Pollution Emergencies. This Convention was negotiated under UNEP auspices and was expected to enter into force early in 1987. The Caribbean Environment Program opened a Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) in Kingston, Jamaica, in July 1986 with support from UNEP and office space contributed by the Jamaican Government. The United States has declined on policy grounds to contribute to a Trust Fund of the Caribbean Environment Program, but has spent over one million dollars on projects related to the Caribbean Action Plan. The United States is exploring means of assisting the RCU's operation, as part of our policy of direct support to projects under the Action Plan.

ENVIRONMENT IN THE UNGA

Environmental issues were less prominent in the General Assembly in 1986 than they had been in the previous years. Pursuant to an experimental biennial schedule of sessions, the UNEP Governing Council did not convene in 1986. Thus, there was no GC report to the Assembly on which an environmental agenda item and general resolution could be based as in the past. The General Assembly did, however, adopt a resolution calling for continuation of activities by the UN system, including UNEP, in implementing the 1977 UN Action Plan to Combat Desertification. Despite some reservations over UNEP's role in implementation of the Action Plan, the United States was able to join a consensus in favor of this resolution.

HARMFUL PRODUCTS

On the subject of the United Nations "Consolidated List of Products Whose Consumption and/or Sale Have Been Banned, Withdrawn, Severely Restricted or Not Approved by Governments," the Secretary General of the United Nations issued the progress report (A/41/329) requested by Resolution 39/229 of 1984. That resolution asked for a report in 1986 and every 3 years thereafter on the subject of implementation of resolutions relating to the consolidated list. The Secretary-General's report largely met the concerns expressed by the United States in previous

years (see *U.S. in the UN, 1985*, page 154). However, it also indicated that the UN Center for Transnational Corporations (UNCTC) was planning to prepare a companion document for the consolidated list containing commercial data which the United States believed could be discriminatory against western industry. These views were made known to the Director of the Center and to the UN staff responsible for preparation of the list.

At the summer session of the Economic and Social Council, the U.S. delegation introduced a resolution which would have the Council endorse various portions of the Secretary General's report, including the conclusion of memoranda of understanding between WHO, UNEP, and the United Nations in which certain responsibilities were delegated to WHO and UNEP. The draft resolution also said the Council "agrees with the conclusion of the Secretary-General in paragraph 15 of his report that the task of including in the consolidated list commercial information about products on the list would require a level of effort in terms of data collection and verification which significantly exceeds the current capabilities of the United Nations, UNEP and WHO." One result of the U.S. draft resolution would have been elimination of the companion document of commercial information and the role of the UNCTC in preparation of the list.

The U.S. approach to the consolidated list was not accepted by ECOSOC. Venezuela introduced amendments which substantially changed the intent of the U.S. resolution. These amendments were accepted in the first committee by a vote of 42 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed, and 2 abstaining. As a result, the United States withdrew its sponsorship of the resolution. Venezuela assumed the sponsorship, and the resolution was adopted by a vote of 43 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed, and 1 abstaining. The approved resolution had the effect of continuing the work of the UNCTC regarding the preparation of commercial data and of combining the commercial data and the basic consolidated list in one document. In plenary, the resolution (1986/72) was adopted by a vote of 49 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstaining. Bernard Engel of the U.S. Delegation, explaining U.S. concerns about the failure of its original resolution to be adopted, told the Council that "almost every other Member State of the Council has chosen to ignore the problems identified by the Secretary-General in his report on this aspect of his work. Instead, they intend that "business as usual" be the rule despite the serious shortcomings that he has reported to them. The Government of the United States does not share this attitude."

At the UNGA in the fall, Yugoslavia, on behalf of the G-77, introduced a draft decision entitled "Protection Against Products Harmful to Health and the Environment." The draft decision was that the Assembly "decides to endorse" the resolution adopted earlier by ECOSOC. U.S. Delegates privately told other delegates they could accept a decision which "takes note" of the ECOSOC action but not a text endorsing a resolution that the U.S. Delegation had opposed. Yugoslavia and other cosponsors would not change the UNGA draft decision, and the second committee adopted it by a vote of 136 in favor, 1 (U.S) opposed, and 1 abstaining. In the plenary, the decision was approved by a vote of 146 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed and 1 abstaining.

Chester Norris of the U.S. Delegation told the UNGA plenary that the United States believed the Secretary-General had done a commendable job in handling the issue over the preceding year and that because of the substantial progress made in meeting U.S. concerns, the United States in fact was prepared not to oppose continued production of the consolidated list, even though it had voted against resolutions creating the list. However, a new issue had arisen, he said, that of the companion document of commercial information prepared by the UNCTC. The ECOSOC resolution had combined the list and the commercial data in one document, and the working copy of the revised list (which was to be issued in early 1987) "confirms our fears about this effort." Mr. Norris said the UNCTC does not have available to it commercial data on all manufacturers of products included in the list, and its data cannot help but be discriminatory against manufacturers in the Western industrialized countries who are open with their commercial and regulatory data, while it protects manufacturers in socialist and developing nations who do not make such information freely available. He cited one entry in the working copy of the revised list which appeared to supply misleading information and made clear that neither the U.S. Government nor U.S. industry could take responsibility for the accuracy of the data presented in relation to U.S. manufacturers or products. He said the Secretary-General had done a good job in implementing some very difficult resolutions on this subject, but that ECOSOC "now has gone too far in incorporating highly specious and misleading information into the text of the consolidated list, particularly the discriminatory commercial data produced by the Center for Transnational Corporations." He urged that the UN secretariat take new steps to ensure that the consolidated list is fair, objective, and truly meaningful.

United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

The UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR)* was established by the General Assembly in 1955 to provide continuous review and evaluation of the effects of ionizing radiation on humans and their environment. Radiation in this context covers both natural and man-made (i.e. from atmospheric and surface nuclear-weapons tests, nuclear power plants, and peaceful nuclear explosions), environmental radiation, and medical and occupational exposures.

Under its terms of reference, the Committee receives, assembles, and compiles reports and information furnished by its Member States, members of the United Nations, specialized agencies, the IAEA, and nongovernmental organizations on observed levels of ionizing radiation, and on scientific observations and experiments relevant to the effects of ionizing radiation on man and his environment.

Since its establishment, the Committee has prepared and submitted to the UN General Assembly five comprehensive reports on the effects of ionizing radiation. In addition to collation and evaluation of the literature on radiation effects, UNSCEAR agreed in 1973 to evaluate the radiological hazards created by the testing activities of one country. To date, no such evaluations have been requested. The recent accident at the Chernobyl nuclear reactor in the U.S.S.R. has resulted in preparation of a preliminary document entitled "Assessment of the Long Term Impact of the Chernobyl Accident." This will be reviewed at the next (36th) Session of UNSCEAR.

The 35th Session of UNSCEAR met in Vienna from April 14 through April 18, 1986. The U.S. Representative was Robert D. Moseley, Jr., M.D., Professor of Radiology at the University of New Mexico. The session was concerned with continuing consideration of chapters for monographic reports to the General Assembly on the effects of ionizing radiation in the following fields:

—the scientific bases for the evaluation of radiation risk and detriment, including an analysis of factors involved in risk perception;

*The member states are: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Sudan, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States.

—doses from natural sources of radiation with particular emphasis on the variability of such doses as a function of time and location;

—doses to the world population from nuclear explosions;

—the exposure, both general and occupational, arising from the nuclear fuel cycle, with particular emphasis on the problem of radioactive wastes;

—doses from the medical uses of radiation;

—the biological effects of prenatal irradiation with special consideration on findings in man;

—the early effects of high doses of radiation on man;

—specialized topics relating to the genetic effects of irradiation;

—radiation-induced tumors in man, with a reevaluation of the risk factors.

The Committee has decided that, for the near future, systematic reports of the type presented at the 37th Session of the General Assembly would not be warranted. Accordingly, the Committee is developing shorter reports with scientific annexes on the specialized topics mentioned, as soon as the relevant studies are completed. In 1986 the Committee published a comprehensive report titled "Genetic and Somatic Effects of Ionizing Radiation" limited in scope to the following subjects:

—genetic effects of radiation;

—dose-response relationships for radiation induced cancer;

—biological effects of prenatal irradiation.

The 36th Session of UNSCEAR scheduled for March 23-27, 1987 in Vienna, will continue consideration of draft documents with a view to presentation of the remaining subjects at the September 1988 meeting of the General Assembly.

New and Renewable Sources of Energy (NRSE)

The UN Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy met in New York from June 9-13, 1986. This was the third session of the committee since adoption of the UN Program of Action for New and Renewable Sources of Energy in Nairobi in 1981. An Interim Committee met in Rome in 1982 and discussed the role of the UN system in this field. Three meetings of the NRSE committee have made little progress in mobilizing development efforts in this area.

Although we have a substantial interest in the development of new and renewable energy sources, the United States does not

view the United Nations as having a central directive role to play. We prefer to emphasize the importance of bilateral assistance and the private sector. In order to limit the expansion of the UN bureaucracy in this field, the United States opposed the establishment of permanent institutional arrangements for implementing the Nairobi Plan of Action from the outset. A U.S. proposal that followup functions be carried out by the already-existing Committee on Natural Resources was rejected by other delegations.

The third session of the committee in June of 1986 devoted most of its time to negotiating two resolutions of little import, leaving almost no time for practical discussion of ongoing projects. The United States questioned the disjointed nature of the UN effort (e.g., 17 different agencies have NRSE projects), the size of the UN bureaucracy administering these programs, and the lack of achievement which the United Nations can claim in this area. Our delegate requested the committee to review its results and suggested that the lack of progress indicated that the committee could be eliminated. Although a number of delegations supported this suggestion, the Group of 77 perceived it not as an effort to rationalize work and save valuable resources, but as an attempt to retreat from multilateral cooperation. They opposed the suggestion and no progress was made at this session on the eventual elimination of this body.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

In 1979 the General Assembly created three bodies to deal with science and technology for development: (1) the Intergovernmental Committee for Science and Technology for Development (IGCSTD) to formulate policy guidelines and identify priorities and activities in this area, which would be open for participation by all UN members; (2) the Center for Science and Technology for Development to coordinate science and technology activities within the United Nations at the Secretariat level and to serve the Intergovernmental Committee; and (3) the Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development which would use voluntary contributions to support science and technology activities and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) would administer until the end of 1981. The General Assembly gave the Interim Fund permanent status in 1982 as the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development.

In 1982 the General Assembly adopted a resolution designed to keep open the institutional debate on science and technology for development. Although the resolution established long-term financial and institutional arrangements, it left open to negotiation the difficult questions of the proposed financing plan and the voting arrangements for its Executive Board. These were further negotiated at two sessions of the IGCSTD in 1983. Since attendees could not reach agreement, the Secretary General was asked to undertake consultations with governments on the financing issues again and, if he were satisfied that there was sufficient interest, to call a pledging conference. Since insufficient interest was found among governments, the Secretary General did not convene the pledging conference.

Each year thereafter, the same issues arose. Member nations expressed insufficient interest, and voluntary contributions sufficient to support proposed activities failed to materialize.

In 1985 the Secretary-General and the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development again prepared operating proposals. The proposed system would be closely linked to the operations of the UN Development Program (UNDP) and would provide for a modest staff. While the United States did not oppose science and technology activity carried out through a separate UN organization, we continued to oppose the establishment of "multilaterally-pooled funds" for this purpose. The United States recommended that the United Nations limit its activities to playing a brokers role, bringing together potential projects in developing countries with sources of financing and technology in the developed world, including the private sector. While the Financing System Secretariat has made serious efforts to accommodate the concerns of the United States and other potential donors, we declined to contribute to an organization that envisaged common pooling of funds to be used to support scientific programs, training, and research in the participating countries.

In the face of declining interest on the part of Western and OPEC member governments, either in reaching agreement on the structure and financing of the Financing System or in contributing significant sums for science and technology assistance, the UN Director General for Development and International Cooperation prepared recommendations for the Intergovernmental Committee providing for termination of the Financing System and the transfer of its activities and residual resources to a trust fund under UNDP management. (In effect, this proposal would recognize the practical arrangements which had been in place since 1980.)

The Intergovernmental Committee, at its June 2-6 session, approved the proposals of the Director General. Upon receiving the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee, the UNDP Governing Council in late June, by a unanimous decision: 1) established a trust fund for science and technology for development with effect from January 1, 1987; 2) stipulated that the administrative costs of this new facility would be borne by the fund itself; 3) invited governments which would have contributed to the Financing System to transfer such pledges to the trust fund; 4) urged all governments and the international community as a whole to provide resources to the new fund; and 5) requested the Administrator of UNDP to report to the Council in 1987 on the organizational structure, staffing, and budget of the new facility.

Acting upon the decision of the Governing Council, the UN General Assembly in Resolution 41/183 decided to terminate the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and to transfer its responsibilities and resources to a facility within UNDP entitled "The UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development" (UNFSTD). The Administrator of UNDP, to achieve better coherence in operational and administrative terms, decided to merge the UNDP Energy Office with that of UNFSTD. Each element in this combined office will maintain its separate funding mechanism.

University for Peace

The United States joined the UN consensus decision (1980) which created the University of Peace. Nonetheless, the United States has reservations about the capacity of the University for Peace to acquire the funding base and academic infrastructure necessary to make a sustained academic contribution to high-level analysis of peace issues. As a government, the United States played no role in the University for Peace during 1986.

UN University

The United States as a government played no role in the UN University during 1986. It has not made a contribution to the UN University trust fund. It is, nonetheless, generally supportive of its activities.

UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)

The UN General Assembly established the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in 1965 as the result of U.S. initiatives embodied in UNGA resolutions in 1962 and 1963. UNITAR is an autonomous UN institution intended to enhance the effectiveness of the structure and functioning of the UN system by means of training and research. Since January 1983, Dr. Michel Doo-Kingue (Cameroon) has directed UNITAR.

The Secretary-General, in consultation with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the ECOSOC, appoints members of the Board of Trustees, who serve for 3-year terms. In addition to appointed members, four are *ex-officio* Board members: the UN Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly, the President of the ECOSOC, and the Executive Director of UNITAR. In 1986 the Board of Trustees consisted of 27 appointed members, who serve in their personal capacity and not as formal representatives of governments. Assistant Secretary of State Alan L. Keyes represents the United States on the Board of Trustees.

The UNITAR Board of Trustees held its 24th session from April 7 to 11, 1986, under the chairmanship of the Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations. The main items discussed were the future of UNITAR, and related issues, including ways to restore Member States' faith and confidence in the Institute, UNITAR's serious financial situation, and a plan for restructuring the Institute as proposed by the Executive Director.

When UNITAR was established, the General Assembly stipulated that it was to be funded by voluntary contributions. Beginning in 1980 and continuing through 1985, however, the General Assembly decided to cover UNITAR's operating budget deficits with grants or loans from the UN regular budget over the strong objections of the United States. When in 1985 the General Assembly voted to grant UNITAR \$1.5 million from the General Fund, on an exceptional basis, to supplement voluntary contributions (Resolution 39/177), the United States responded by asking Congress to reduce the U.S. contribution to UNITAR by the amount of the U.S. proportionate share of the \$1.5 million grant, or \$375,000. Since the General Assembly did not resolve the Institute's long-term financial problem in 1985 within UNITAR's mandate, the United States did not make a pledge to UNITAR for 1986, and it has not pledged since 1986.

By 1986 the United States had become convinced that the value of UNITAR to the UN system did not justify the Institute's continued existence, especially if it could not operate within a budget level obtained solely from voluntary contributions, as

originally intended and mandated by the General Assembly. The United States made this point at the April 1986 annual Board meeting, in the statement of the U.S. Board member, Ambassador Alan L. Keyes:

The U.S. has consistently opposed financial arrangements put in place by the UNGA that made this (UNITAR), a voluntary funded organization, dependent on the assessed budget of the UN. We must now face realities and avoid temporary solutions. I do not believe that the proposed restructuring of UNITAR will reverse the decline in donor support over the long run. Although I believe that certain elements of UNITAR's program are still valid, they collectively do not justify the expense of maintaining a separate Institute. I believe therefore that the best solution to this problem would be to close the Institute down and reallocate those functions deemed to be worthwhile to other bodies within the UN system.

Although the General Assembly had granted UNITAR \$1.5 million in 1985, the General Assembly was conscious of concerns expressed by contributors about the Institute, and in Resolution 40/214 called on the Secretary-General to prepare a report weighing the two options of either closing or restructuring UNITAR. In his report to the General Assembly in 1986 (A/41/521), the Secretary-General acknowledged the value of UNITAR to the UN system, and proposed a restructuring plan for the Institute, to be implemented over a 3-year period (1987-1989).

The U.S. position at the opening of the 41st General Assembly was that UNITAR should be closed and its functions reallocated within other parts of the UN system. In the ensuing discussions of the Secretary-General's report and the UNITAR Executive Director's proposed restructuring plan (Supplement No. 14, A/41/14), however, the United States agreed that the restructuring plan had some merit and was an attempt to reform UNITAR. Thus, when the General Assembly approved the resolution (Resolution 41/172) containing a restructuring plan for UNITAR, the United States joined the consensus.

The approved restructuring plan took effect on January 1, 1987, although UNITAR had already begun to incorporate certain elements into its program in late 1986.

Among other changes, the plan returns UNITAR to its former status as a voluntarily-funded UN body, assumes that the Secretary-General will phase out the Institute in a cost-effective manner if sufficient funds are not forthcoming, and reduces UNITAR's budget from \$2.55 million in 1986 to \$1.6 million in 1987. The restructuring also places predominant emphasis on the Institute's training function, and gives first priority under its research function to projects that "enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations."

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The principal human rights organ of the United Nations, the Commission on Human Rights (UNHRC), held its 42d annual session February 3 to March 14, 1986. Assistant Secretary for H.R. and HA Richard Schifter, the U.S. Representative to the Commission headed the United States delegation. ECOSOC subsequently considered the Commission's report at its First Regular Session in New York from April 29 to May 23, 1986. In addition, the General Assembly's 41st Session, held from September 16 to December 19, 1986, considered a lengthy agenda of human rights issues. The Commission's expert Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities did not meet in 1986 due to budgetary cutbacks.

Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance

The United States introduced a resolution during the 42d session of the UNHRC calling for the appointment of a Special Rapporteur on religious intolerance a by-study concern. The adoption of this resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief" (Resolution 1986/20) by the wide margin of 26 to 5 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions marked a victory for Western interests in the Commission and a clear case in which the United States took the lead in winning adoption of a resolution requiring the support of countries from many regions of the world. The Soviet satellities and Syrici were the only ones to vote against the resolution.

The First Regular Session of ECOSOC endorsed the Commission's decision to appoint a Special Rapporteur to examine government actions in all parts of the world inconsistent with past United Nations declarations concerning religious tolerance. (Decision 1986/34)

At the 41st UN General Assembly (UNGA), the subject of the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance was again discussed as a major human rights issue. Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne delivered a strong statement deploring religious persecution in the Soviet Union and Communist countries. A draft resolution was introduced by Ireland reaffirming the principles of the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief and calling for an end to religious intolerance. The Soviets did not challenge the resolution and it was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 41/112)

Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East

Following the pattern set since 1968, at the outset of its 42d session the Commission on Human Rights debated the agenda item entitled "Question of the Violation of Human Rights in the Occupied Arab Territories, Including Palestine". The United States vigorously opposed this annual and fruitless debate for its exaggerated and inaccurate rhetoric condemning Israel. Once again, the Bangladeshi delegation put forward a two-part resolution, cosponsored mainly by Arab and Communist countries, which contained the annual string of unsupported condemnations of alleged Israeli policies and practices. Part A of Resolution 1986/1 passed by a vote of 29 to 7 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. Part B focused upon the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and contained further allegations of Israeli violations. The draft resolution contained one provision reaffirming that the Geneva Convention is applicable to all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. In a separate vote on this provision, the United States voted in favor, but later voted against Part B as a whole. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 32 to 1 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions.

A companion resolution, 1986/2, introduced by the representative of Nicaragua and cosponsored by several Arab and Communist countries, dealt with the human rights situation in occupied Syrian territories. This resolution, an almost exact copy of a previous Indian resolution submitted in 1985, contained numerous objectionable paragraphs, including unsubstantiated allegations against Israel and criticism of the "pro-Israeli position of a Permanent Member of the Security Council," which prevents Council action. This resolution was approved by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions.

At the 41st UN General Assembly, resolutions concerning Israel seemed little more than exercises in propaganda. One resolution, 41/63, was once again discussed in the Special Political Committee under the agenda item "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories," and addressed Israeli practices in the Occupied Territories.

Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa

The subject of racial discrimination, with the focus on apartheid in South Africa, featured prominently on the agendas of the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly in 1986. At the 42d Commission session, racial discrimination and apart-

heid were considered under a cluster of four agenda items which regularly appear on the Commission's agendas year after year. In the debate, Ambassador Schifter expressed the revulsion the U.S. Government feels towards apartheid. He presented a defense of U.S. policies vis-a-vis South Africa and outlined what America was willing to do to end this degrading system. He asked that the U.S. policy of moderation and gradual change be given the time to succeed.

At the 42d Human Rights Commission it remained the goal of the U.S. Delegation to achieve agreement on at least one draft resolution under the cluster of agenda items which would have recorded the universal condemnation of the apartheid system felt by all delegations and thus could have been adopted by consensus. Unfortunately, negotiations with African Delegations to this end did not succeed. The resolution concerning the situation of human rights in South Africa, based upon the report of the Commission's *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on South Africa (first established by the Commission in 1967) and containing general condemnations of apartheid, also had a number of other provisions which the United States could not accept. The United States abstained on the resolution concerning the situation of human rights in South Africa. The final vote was 39 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1986/4)

Another resolution concerning the situation of human rights in Namibia was adopted by a vote of 36 to 0, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions. The U.S. abstention was based upon the role being pursued by the United States in assisting all parties concerned to arrive at a peaceful, negotiated solution which will facilitate the earliest possible independence for Namibia. (Resolution 1986/3) The United States voted against a third resolution, another in a long series of resolutions carrying the title, "The adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist regimes in southern Africa." The vote was 29 to 5 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. The United States and others rejected provisions of that resolution which condemned various forms of economic activity carried out by Western corporations in South Africa. (Resolution 1986/5) At the same meeting, the Commission considered a draft resolution under the same title recommended by the Subcommission for adoption by the Commission, and adopted by a vote of 32 to 4 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. The resolution endorsed the work of its Special Rapporteur on "adverse consequences." Resolution 1986/7 concerning the implementation of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 ab-

stentions. In this case, the United States' negative vote was due to the fact that the resolution contained provisions equating apartheid with genocide and condemning transnational corporations engaged in legal activities. Finally, a resolution relating to the implementation of the Program of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/8) The United States did not participate in this vote, following its settled policy of nonparticipation in voting on resolutions relating to the Second Decade. The policy of nonparticipation dates from the adoption by the UN General Assembly in 1975 of a resolution equating racism with Zionism.

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, 1986, the subject of "Adverse Consequence . . ." again figured on the agenda because of a draft decision introduced by Senegal providing all due assistance to the Special Rapporteur. It was adopted by a vote of 32 to 7 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Decision 1986/13)

At the 41st UNGA, four resolutions were adopted on items relating to racial discrimination and apartheid after consideration by the Third Committee. The United States again did not participate in the consensus adoption of a resolution relating to the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. (Resolution 41/94), since the UNGA resolution 3379. The resolution also contained a number of operative paragraphs expressing encouragement to governments to continue their support for the Decade program and endorsing certain measures under that program. A routine procedural resolution concerning the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (signed by the United States and awaiting action by the Senate) was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/104) Resolution 41/103 concerning the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 128 to 1 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. The U.S. negative vote was due mainly to provisions in the resolution equating apartheid with genocide and elaborating the idea that transnational corporations operating in South Africa are committing the "crime of apartheid." Finally, a resolution on the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/105)

Self-Determination

The right to self-determination retained its place on the agendas of human rights organs in 1986 as one of the most widely discussed of the basic human rights. At its 42d session, the Human Rights Commission adopted six resolutions under this re-

curing agenda item. A resolution on the denial of human rights in Afghanistan was put forward by the Representative of Pakistan. The resolution, which reaffirmed the Commission's concern for the denial of human rights in Afghanistan and called for the immediate removal of foreign troops from Afghan territory, was approved by a vote of 31 (U.S.) to 6, with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/23) A draft resolution was again introduced in the Commission dealing with the right of self-determination for Palestine. A number of the resolution's preambular and operative paragraphs were directed specifically against Israel. The U.S. Representative called for separate voting on these paragraphs. One paragraph denounced the United States for entering an agreement on Strategic Cooperation with Israel on November 30, 1981. This particularly odious paragraph was retained by a vote of 17 to 14 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was approved by a vote of 28 to 8 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/22) A resolution concerning the question of Western Sahara, sponsored by Algeria and other mostly African cosponsors and laying down procedures and terms for the political solution of the question, was approved by a vote of 29 (U.S.) to 0 with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/21) The question of self-determination for Kampuchea (Cambodia) was addressed in a resolution proposed by the Philippines and cosponsored by other Asian, Western, and Latin American delegations. In its principal operative paragraphs, this resolution reaffirmed that the continuing illegal occupation of Kampuchea by foreign forces deprives the people of Kampuchea of the right to self-determination and constitutes the primary violation of human rights in Kampuchea at present. The Commission approved the resolution by a vote of 30 (U.S.) to 9, with 2 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/25) Finally, the Commission approved a resolution introduced by the Congo on "The Use of Mercenaries as a Means to Impede the Exercise of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination" by a vote of 32 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/26) The United States opposed this resolution, which urged States to prohibit the recruitment, financing, training, and transit of mercenaries, as outside the Commission's mandate and duplicative of work by the UN General Assembly's Sixth Committee.

In 1986 the First Regular Session of ECOSOC passed a supporting decision complementary to UN Human Rights Commission Resolution 1986/25. By a vote of 41 (U.S.) to 6, with 4 abstentions, ECOSOC adopted a resolution on Kampuchean self-determination proposed by ASEAN and other cosponsors. The decision reaffirmed the principal operative paragraphs of Commission Resolution 1986/25, expressed grave concern at the severity and scope

of attacks on Kampuchean civilians located in Thai refugee camps, and requested the Secretary-General to report to ECOSOC any further violations of humanitarian principles perpetrated against Kampuchean civilian refugees by foreign occupying troops along the border. The Council also adopted by a vote of 36 to 7 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions, a resolution on "The Use of Mercenaries . . ." urging the UNHRC to appoint a Special Rapporteur on mercenaries. (Resolution XI)

The 41st UNGA approved three more resolutions concerning the right to self-determination. A general resolution entitled "Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination" presented by Pakistan and other cosponsors declared the Assembly's "firm opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, since these have resulted in the suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination and other human rights in certain parts of the world." The resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 41/100) A much more controversial draft resolution proposed by the African group contained 37 operative paragraphs featuring numerous provisions directed at the policies of Western states and Israel, both in South Africa and Palestine, and contained a strong call for sanctions against South Africa. The resolution was approved by a vote of 128 to 18 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. (Resolution 41/101) Finally, the UNGA approved by a vote of 120 to 11 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions, a resolution on "The Use of Mercenaries . . ." taking note of ECOSOC's request to the UNHRC for a Special Rapporteur. (Resolution 41/102)

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Again in 1986, interest in the economic, social, and cultural group of human rights on the part of less-developed countries was mainly focused on the discussion of a so-called new human right to development. At its 42d session, the Commission received another progress report from its Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development. A representative of Yugoslavia introduced a draft text urging adoption of its draft Declaration on the Right to Development by the 41st UN General Assembly. The text was approved by the Commission by a vote of 34 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/16)

Also adopted under the agenda item relating to economic, social, and cultural rights was a draft resolution proposed by the German Democratic Republic and other cosponsors which generally was designed to heighten the place given to the economic, social, and cultural group of rights in the Commission's debates.

The draft resolution contained a provision recognizing that the realization of the right to development will promote the enjoyment of economic, social, and cultural rights and contained operative provisions highlighting the importance of economic rights such as the rights to food, to work, and to education and health. This resolution was approved by a vote of 32 to 7 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/15)

Finally, the delegation of Yugoslavia carried forward its special interest in the subject of "popular participation in its various forms as an important factor in development and in the full realization of all human rights" by proposing a draft resolution which was procedural in nature, taking note of and requesting the circulation of a study prepared by the Secretary-General on the right to popular participation. This resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1986/14)

At its First Regular Session of 1986, ECOSOC approved Decision 1986/1 by a vote of 37 to 1 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. This decision endorsed the Commission's Resolution 1986/16 and authorized the convening of the Commission's Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development in January 1987.

The right to development was the principal subject considered in the UNGA under the agenda item entitled, "Alternative Approaches and Ways and Means Within the UN System for Improving the Effective Enjoyment of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms." Debate centered upon the Yugoslav draft Declaration which was annexed to a draft resolution circulated by the Yugoslav Delegation. The draft contained a single operative paragraph according to which the Assembly would decide to adopt the Declaration and was adopted by a vote of 146 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 41/128) In addition, the Assembly adopted by a vote of 133 to 11 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions, a resolution on the right to development calling for assistance to developing countries as part of a so-called right to development. (Resolution 41/133)

Finally, the UNGA adopted by a vote of 109 (U.S.) to 0, with 41 abstentions, a resolution introduced and sponsored only by the U.S. calling for "Respect for the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others and its contribution to the economic and social development of Member States." (Resolution 41/132)

Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment

The Human Rights Commission annually examines as a continuing area of human rights concern the question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment. Connected with this agenda item are the subissues of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and the question of enforced or involuntary disappearances.

Australia again introduced a resolution expressing concern at the extensive occurrence of detention in many parts of the world of persons who exercise the right to freedom of opinion and expression. The principal operative paragraph appealed to all States to ensure respect and support for the rights of all persons who exercise the right to freedom of opinion and expression. This resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1985/17)

The subject of torture was addressed in three other resolutions approved under this agenda item. A resolution sponsored by Norway and other mainly Western delegations dealt with the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/47)

Also adopted without a vote was a resolution, again put forward by Norway which the United States joined as a cosponsor, encouraging support for the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture. (Resolution 1986/48)

Finally, a resolution put forward by Belgium, which the United States joined as cosponsor, extended the mandate of the Special Rapporteur appointed the previous year to examine questions relevant to torture. This resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/50)

France again took the lead on the subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances by proposing a resolution in which the Commission decided to extend for two years on a trial basis the mandate of its Working Group. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/55)

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, 1986, the extension of the mandate of the Working Group on Disappearances was approved (Decision 1985/6) as was the appointment of a Special Rapporteur to examine questions relevant to torture. (Decision 1985/7)

At the UNGA, Resolutions 41/134 and 41/135, adopted without a vote, dealt with the subjects of the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the United Nations Voluntary Fund for

Victims of Torture, respectively, in terms similar to those already contained in the two resolutions adopted earlier in the year on the same subjects by the UN Human Rights Commission.

The subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances was again addressed by a resolution proposed by France and other co-sponsors. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/145)

Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments

Human rights standard-setting through the drafting of conventions or declarations proceeded in 1986 in five areas.

Rights of the Child

A Working Group of the Commission on Human Rights met again for one week prior to the opening of the 42d session of the Commission to carry on its work of elaborating a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child. The work has been underway since 1979. At its 1986 session, the Working Group adopted seven additional articles. Having received the report of its Working Group, the Commission adopted without a vote Resolution 1986/59. Under this resolution the Commission decided to continue at its 43rd session, as a matter of highest priority, its work on the elaboration of a draft Convention. A one-week session of the Working Group was scheduled to be held prior to the 43rd UNHRC session.

At the 41st General Assembly, another procedural resolution on the question of a Convention on the Rights of the Child was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/115) The resolution generally encouraged the Commission to proceed with its work on the draft Convention and to make every effort at its 43rd session to complete the draft Convention.

Human Rights of Migrant Workers

A Working Group on the drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families was established by the UNGA in 1979. One session of this Working Group was held in 1986 during the 41st session of the UNGA from September 28-October 3. The Working Group continued the second reading of a revised text, adopting an additional paragraph in Article 1, Articles 4-16, and one paragraph in Article 17. Both the Commission and the UNGA have been following the work of the Working Group with special interest. At the 42d UNHRC, a resolution proposed by Mexico, adopted without a

vote, welcomed the progress which the Working Group had been making. (Resolution 1986/58) At the 41st UNGA there was also adopted by a vote of 148 to 1 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions, Resolution 41/151 which expressed satisfaction at the progress reported by the Working Group and provided for two further sessions of the Working Group in 1987 to continue the second reading of the draft Convention. The United States voted against the resolution because it questions the need for this Convention, believes that to the extent a convention is needed it should be negotiated in the International Labor Organization, and objects to the expenditure by the United Nations of funds to support two meetings in 1987 for such a marginal project.

Rights of Minorities

Work on a draft Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National, Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities proceeded during the 42d UNHRC session. In essence, progress on the drafting of a declaration has been marking time until the key definition of the key term "minority" has been supplied to the Commission by its Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. In Resolution 1986/60, adopted without a vote, the Commission decided to establish at its 43rd session an open-ended Working Group to continue consideration of the revised Declaration which has been proposed by Yugoslavia.

Human Rights Defenders

Although the Commission at its 40th session adopted a decision to establish at its 41st session an open-ended Working Group to draft a Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the group did not meet until the 41st UNHRC. It concluded its first session March 12, with the adoption by consensus of its final report. The Commission plenary then adopted without a vote a procedural resolution calling for the Working Group to reconvene in January 1987.

Review of the Work of the Subcommission

Due to budgetary constraints, the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities did not meet in 1986.

Violations of Human Rights

The recurring item on the Commission's annual agenda which relates to violations of human rights in any part of the world again occupied a major part of the Commission's time at its 42d session. A sub-item of this item concerns human rights situations in particular countries brought to the Commission's attention under the confidential procedures established by ECOSOC Resolution 1503 (XLVIII). As announced publicly by the Chairman after the close of the Commission's confidential debate, the Commission took up in private sessions the human rights situations in Albania, Gabon, Haiti, Paraguay, the Philippines, Turkey, and Zaire. The Chairman also announced that consideration of the situations relating to Gabon, the Philippines, and Turkey would be terminated.

The public debate under the violations agenda item was, as usual, marked by general statements by a large number of the Commission members surveying the state of human rights throughout the world. Ambassador Schifter explained the concerns of the U.S. Government over negative human rights developments in Chile, Cuba, Nicaragua, Iran, Ethiopia, Poland, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union. In the case of Cuba, he argued that "Cuba is unquestionably the most repressive country in the Western Hemisphere and ranks among the most repressive in the world." Nicaragua, he added, represents another government in Latin America "which has sought to emulate the Cuban dictatorship." In addition, he pointed to the plight of Ethiopians caught up in a massive and forced resettlement program of famine victims, especially from the northern regions to other parts of the country. This program had involved the transport and resettlement of over 500,000 persons. Schifter expressed U.S. Government concern over the massive cruelty with which this program was being carried out.

In public session, the Commission adopted seven resolutions, five of which dealt with separate country situations. As concerns the human rights situation in El Salvador, the Commission received another report from its Special Representative, Mr. Pastor Ridruejo, and acted upon a draft resolution proposed by Costa Rica and sponsored by France, Mexico, Peru, Spain, Yugoslavia, Honduras, and Norway. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 39 (U.S.) to 0, with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/39) The resolution extended the mandate of the Special Representative for another year and more closely reflected the actual situation in that country.

With respect to the human rights situation in Guatemala, the Commission received another report from its Special Rapporteur, Viscount Colville of Culross. A draft resolution was proposed by Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Venezuela, and other Latin co-sponsors. Several Western countries, including Norway and France, introduced amendments calling for greater progress in the human rights situation in Guatemala, which resulted in a revised Venezuelan text. Following the introduction of the revised draft resolution, Norway, on behalf of the cosponsors of their amendments, withdrew the amendments. The revised resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/62)

The Special Rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan, Mr. Felix Ermacora, presented another report to the Commission on the basis of which a draft resolution was proposed by Belgium and other, mainly Western, cosponsors. The draft resolution reviewed the details of widespread grave and massive human rights violation being committed in Afghanistan and urged "the authorities in Afghanistan" to put a stop to them. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was extended for another year. The resolution was approved by a vote of 28 (U.S.) to 9, with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/40)

Concerning human rights in Iran, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights informed the Commission that, due to the resignation of the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Andres Aguilar, there would not be a report on the human rights situation in Iran. The Commission did consider, however, a draft resolution introduced by several Western countries, expressing deep concern at the number and gravity of alleged violations of human rights in Iran, including the situation of minority groups such as the Baha'is indicated in the Special Rapporteur's interim report, and extending the Rapporteur's mandate for another year. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 19 (U.S.) to 4, with 16 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/41)

A resolution on the situation in southern Lebanon was proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic with a number of Arab and Soviet cosponsors. The draft resolution expressed grave concern at Israeli action in southern Lebanon, expressed strong condemnation of human rights violations by Israel, and called on Israel to put an immediate end to repressive practices and release persons detained and abducted. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 25 to 1 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/43)

In addition to the foregoing country-specific resolutions, the Commission adopted two resolutions dealing with human rights problems in general. The Commission approved without a vote a

resolution proposed by Norway and other cosponsors concerning the continuing problem of summary or arbitrary executions taking place in various parts of the world. The resolution's text was based upon a report submitted to the Commission by its Special Rapporteur, Mr. S. Amos Wako. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was continued for another year. (Resolution 1986/42)

A resolution proposed by Australia and other cosponsors, also approved without a vote, concerned the human rights and mass exoduses. This resolution was another in a series of resolutions which have expressed the Commission's continuing concern over this problem. (Resolution 1986/45)

Finally, the Commission followed the pattern of previous sessions in deciding without a vote to postpone a subitem relating to the question of human rights in Cyprus. The Commission adopted a decision that the debate on the subitem should be postponed to its next session, it being understood that action required by previous resolutions of the Commission on the subject should continue to remain operative. (Decision 1986/103)

In a separate action, the Representative of the United States introduced a draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Ethiopia. The resolution expressed concern over reports relating to the Government's resettlement program and called upon the UN system to ensure that relief funds were being used in a way consistent with respect for human rights and to consider this question at the Commission's 43rd session. Before a vote could be taken on the substance of the resolution, Senegal moved to take no decision on the draft resolution. This motion was adopted by a vote of 29 to 12 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. The Western countries, plus Japan and Costa Rica, opposed the motion. Mauritania and Venezuela abstained. (Decision 1986/105)

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, 1986, the Commission's resolution on summary or arbitrary executions, the text of which had been phrased in terms calling for ECOSOC approval, was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1986/4) Also approved were extensions of the mandates of individuals dealing with four country situations as follows: the Special Representative on human rights in El Salvador, without a vote (Decision 1986/3), the Special Rapporteur on human rights in Guatemala, without a vote (Decision 1986/8), the Special Rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan, by a vote of 36 (U.S.) to 7, with 5 abstentions (Decision 1986/4), and the Special Representative on human rights in Iran, by a vote of 24 (U.S.) to 7, with 13 abstentions. (Decision 1986/5)

The 41st General Assembly considered the usual concentration of country situations in Latin America (Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala), as well as Afghanistan and Iran.

A draft resolution on human rights in Afghanistan, proposed by mainly Western European cosponsors, which repeated the Commission's concern over the widespread violations of human rights in Afghanistan as revealed by the Special Rapporteur, was approved by a vote of 89 (U.S.) to 24, with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 41/158)

A draft resolution on human rights in El Salvador was approved by a vote of 110 (U.S.) to 0, with 40 abstentions. (Resolution 41/156) A resolution on human rights in Guatemala was adopted by a vote of 134 (U.S.) to 0, with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 41/156) The General Assembly also adopted a draft resolution on human rights in Iran by a vote of 61 (U.S.) to 32, with 42 abstentions. (Resolution 41/159) The Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution on summary or arbitrary executions. (Resolution 41/144) These resolutions largely echoed the provisions of resolutions adopted earlier in the year by the Commission on Human Rights and ECOSOC and expressed support for the efforts of the Commission's Special Rapporteurs to assist the Commission in coping with human rights problems throughout the world.

A draft resolution on human rights and mass exoduses was proposed in terms similar to those contained in the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights adopted earlier in the year and called for continued attention to the problem of mass exoduses of refugees and displaced persons, including its root causes. The resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 41/148)

Human Rights in Chile

Unlike other country situations considered by the Commission on Human Rights at its 42d session under the item relating to human rights violations in any part of the world, the question of human rights in Chile was again considered under a separate agenda item. In accordance with the practice of many previous sessions, Mexico joined with other cosponsors in presenting a draft resolution. Arguing that the Mexican draft was unbalanced and inaccurate, the U.S. Delegation introduced a draft resolution on Chile based on the report of the Special Rapporteur, the former Costa Rican Foreign Minister Fernando Volio Jimenez, and highlighted obstacles to democracy and continuing human rights problems. After some negotiation between the two sides, the United States introduced a revised text. On March 14, a draft resolution was proposed by the Chairman of the Commission iden-

tical to the revised text introduced by the United States. Following the introduction of the draft resolution, the sponsors of the Mexican text and the sponsors of the U.S. text withdrew their respective draft resolutions in favor of the Chairman's text, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/63)

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, 1986, the Commission's decision to extend the mandate of its Special Rapporteur on Chile for one year was approved without a vote. (Decision 1986/11)

At the 41st UN General Assembly, a draft resolution on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile was again proposed by Mexico, in company with other cosponsors. The Assembly had before it a preliminary report from the Special Rapporteur. The draft resolution was approved by a vote of 94 to 5 (U.S.), with 52 abstentions. (Resolution 41/161) The United States voted against the resolution, which was unbalanced and failed to reflect accurately the latest Volio report.

Advisory Services

Under the Human Rights Advisory Services Program, based upon UNGA Resolution 926 (X) adopted in 1955, the Secretary General reports annually to the Commission on Human Rights. His report covers three aspects of the Program: advisory services of experts, fellowships and scholarships, and seminars. At the 41st session of the Commission on Human Rights, two resolutions were adopted under the Advisory Services item: The Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of a number of cosponsors, proposed a general resolution designed to record the Commission's continuing interest in this program; the operative paragraphs encouraged the Secretary General to promote activities under the Program. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/52)

In Resolution 1986/53, adopted without a vote, the Commission took note of a report submitted by an expert provided under the Program to the Government of Equatorial Guinea and asked that the government to assist in achieving the goals of the Advisory Services Program.

Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination

At its 42d session, the Commission briefly considered the agenda item which has traditionally been of special interest to Communist countries entitled, "Measures to be taken against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, including Nazi, fas-

cist, and neofascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights, or fundamental freedoms or which have such consequences." An omnibus resolution submitted by Communist countries containing many provisions declaiming against the alleged resurgence of Nazi and fascist ideologies since the Second World War and calling for measures to combat these evils was proposed. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom proposed an amendment to the omnibus resolution designed to discontinue this agenda item. Byelorussian responded by introducing a revised text which proposed to consider this item on a biennial basis. The revised draft resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/61)

At the 41st UNGA, a resolution on the same subject was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/160)

Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights

A recurring item on the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights concerns the status of the International Covenants on Human Rights, the subject of an annual report to the Commission submitted by the Secretary General. On the initiative of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, the item has a subitem concerning the elaboration of a Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. At its 42d session the Commission approved without a vote a draft resolution presented by Norway and other cosponsors which constituted a general appeal for more States to become parties to the Covenants and stressed the need for smoother functioning implementation mechanisms under the Covenants. (Resolution 1986/17)

The Commission also approved without a vote a Byelorussian draft resolution on the crime of genocide which urged all States which have not yet done so to ratify the Genocide Convention. (Resolution 1986/18)

The 41st UN General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution dealing with reporting obligations of States parties to UN conventions on human rights. The resolution was based upon a report by the Secretary General which addressed the growing problem of the failure of States parties to various UN conventions to comply in a timely manner with their reporting obligations under these conventions. In its operative paragraphs, the resolution drew attention to this problem and exhorted governments to improve compliance with their reporting obligations. A number of measures to assist States in carrying out their reporting obligations were also proposed in the resolution. (Resolution 41/119)

Regional Arrangements

Carrying forth its interest in promoting the establishment of regional institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights, the Commission at its 42d session adopted without a vote a draft resolution introduced by the delegation of Sri Lanka and co-sponsored by Australia, Bangladesh, and the Philippines. During the discussion the Representative of Sri Lanka orally revised the draft resolution to add the word "Pacific" after the word "Asian." The draft resolution invited further comments from governments which had not yet commented on the report of the seminar on regional arrangements in the Asian region held in Colombo in 1982. In addition, the Secretary General was requested, in cooperation with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and governments of the region, to consider the establishment of a training course on teaching human rights materials. The Secretary-General was asked to report on the matter to the next Commission session. (Resolution 1986/57)

Science and Technology

The 42d session of the UN Human Rights Commission considered four resolutions under the agenda item relating to science and technology. The first, introduced by Japan and cosponsored by Yugoslavia, on the subject of the use of scientific and technological developments for the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/9) A second resolution, introduced by the Soviet Union, and cosponsored by Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, Nicaragua, and other countries, on the issue of human rights and scientific and technological developments, concerned the relationship between human rights and disarmament. Known as the "right to life" resolution, it was the subject of a motion by the Federal Republic of Germany to take no action. This motion was rejected by a vote of 17 to 13 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 25 to 8 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/10) A third resolution, introduced by Byelorussia and co-sponsored by Bulgaria and Poland, also concerned human rights and scientific and technological developments, called upon the Subcommission to undertake a study on technology and the right to work and development. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 32 to 0, with 11 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1986/11) Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution introduced by the United Kingdom and cosponsored by the United States and others urging completion of the Subcommission's study on the misuse of psychiatry. (Resolution 1986/12)

At the 41st UNGA, three resolutions under this topic were considered. The first, proposed by the United Kingdom and other cosponsors, focused upon the problem of the abuse of psychiatric institutions as a means of controlling human rights dissent. In the draft resolution, the UNGA reaffirmed its conviction that detention of persons in mental institutions on account of their political views or on other nonmedical grounds is a violation of human rights. The single operative paragraph of the resolution urged the Commission on Human Rights and its Subcommission to expedite consideration of a draft Body of Guidelines, Principles and Guarantees relating to this problem. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/114)

Another resolution proposed by the Representative of the Soviet Union on behalf of a collection of mainly Communist cosponsors carried forward a favorite Soviet ploy: utilizing the subject of scientific and technological development as a vehicle for turning a human rights debate into one on disarmament. The resolution proposed by the Soviet Union contained a number of paragraphs, both preambular and operative, which referred to the horrors of past wars as well as the horrors of nuclear weapons, reaffirmed the importance of the inherent right to life and stressed the urgent need for a halt to the arms race and general and complete disarmament. The United States has regularly opposed such resolutions in human rights forums on the grounds that the complex issues involved are being and should be considered in existing disarmament forums. The draft resolution was approved by a vote of 129 to 10 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 41/113)

Another draft resolution proposed by the Byelorussian S.S.R. and cosponsored by mainly Communist delegations centered upon the importance of the implementation of a Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interest of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind, which had been adopted by the General Assembly in 1975. The United States has always regarded this declaration as being unbalanced in that it unduly emphasizes the relationship between science and technology and the so-called economic human rights, while seeming to downplay the importance of the relationship with basic civil and political rights. The resolution was approved by a vote of 131 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/115)

Status of Women

Women's issues were discussed at a series of UN meetings during 1986. The focus of these discussions was the ability of the United Nations to implement the consensus final document of the Nairobi World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, held at Nairobi, Kenya, in late 1985.

That document, known as the Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, represented a constructive departure from the divisive and politicized outcomes of previous conferences held under the aegis of the Decade, and set the stage for a major effort to enhance the effectiveness of UN machinery and programs for the advancement of women. At each of the 1986 meetings, important steps were taken to begin to translate the guidelines of the Forward-Looking Strategies into concrete initiatives. In this process, the U.S. Representative in the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), Maureen Reagan, continued to play a key role.

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The 31st regular session of the CSW, a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council, was held February 24 to March 5, 1986, in Vienna. All of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the CSW were in the form of recommendations to the Council and were subject to Council approval.

The meeting was attended by representatives of 28 of the 32 Member States of the Commission, by observers from 31 other countries, as well as by representatives of UN Specialized Agencies, UN bodies and intergovernmental organizations, national liberation movements and nongovernmental organizations.

The Commission elected Olga Pellicer (Mexico) as chairperson; Hanne Severensen (Denmark), Sukartini Sabekti (Indonesia) and Lombe Chibesakunda (Zambia) as vice chairpersons; and Elena Kostantinovna Ramanovich (Byelorussian S.S.R.) as rapporteur.

The Commission reviewed the results of the Nairobi World Conference and a number of other issues, including the elimination of discrimination against women in accordance with the aims of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women; the participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation; the role of women in development; communications concerning the status of women; and the

program of future work of the Commission, including the provisional agenda for the 32nd (1988) session of the CSW.

Under the agenda item relating to the elimination of discrimination against women, the Commission adopted three consensus resolutions. The first, introduced by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on behalf of a group of Eastern Nations and nonaligned cosponsors on the elimination of discrimination against women and exercise of all their rights, *inter alia*, called upon states, UN bodies and nongovernmental organizations to pay priority attention to the development and implementation of effective measures to secure the exercise by women of their rights, and asked the Secretary-General to take into account the opinions expressed in the Commission on the "rights" to life in peace, education, and work. (The United States does not recognize these as rights but as societal goals.)

The resolution on violence in the family, cosponsored by the United States, *inter alia*, encouraged member states and competent organizations of the UN system to develop or improve data collection on family violence and recommended that the agenda of the expert group meeting on violence in the family, to be convened December 8-12, 1986, in Vienna by the UN Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, be prepared in light of the comments made and the concerns expressed during the 31st session of the CSW.

The third resolution, on women in the United Nations, also cosponsored by the United States, *inter alia*, requested executive heads of organizations participating in the UN system to improve the status of women in those organizations and also called upon member states to nominate more women candidates for policy-making positions in the United Nations.

Under the agenda item relating to the participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation, the Commission adopted six draft resolutions of an essentially political nature, five of them requiring a vote.

A draft resolution on the participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation, introduced by the German Democratic Republic on behalf of a group of Soviet countries and nonaligned states, *inter alia*, called upon Member States and the Commission to take practical institutional, educational, and organizational measures to facilitate women's participation in the decision making process relating to peace, disarmament negotiations, and the solution of conflicts. This draft was adopted by consensus.

The remaining five draft resolutions contained unacceptable recommendations affecting the political *status quo* in the Middle East and southern Africa. Representatives of Western Delegations, including the United States, expressed the view that these drafts were outside the competence of the CSW and contributed little or nothing to an understanding of the unique concerns of women. All of the drafts were adopted in votes, as follows: Palestinian women (E/CN.6/1986/L.5/Rev.1), 18 to 1 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions; women and children under apartheid (E/CN.6/1986/L.9/Rev.2), 20 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 4 abstentions; Namibia (E/CN.6/1986/L.10/Rev.1), 19 to 1 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions; Front-Line States (E/CN.6/1986/L.11/Rev.2), 18 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions; and measures of assistance provided to South African, Namibian and refugee women (E/CN.6/1986/L.8/Rev.1), 18 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions.

Under the agenda item relating to the role of women in development, the Commission adopted four consensus resolutions: updating the world survey on the role of women in development which, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary General to submit a first draft of the updated survey to the 1988 regular session of the CSW; elderly women which, *inter alia*, requested Member States and international organizations to heed the special needs of the elderly; the role of women in society which, *inter alia*, requested Member States and international organizations to pay due attention to all the interrelated aspects of the role of women in society, such as child bearing and child rearing; and the implementation of the Arusha Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of African Women Beyond the United Nations Decade for Women which, *inter alia*, called upon the international community to mobilize support for women's programs and projects in Africa.

Under the agenda item relating to communications concerning the status of women, the Commission adopted one consensus resolution on physical violence against detained women that is specific to their sex. This resolution, *inter alia*, called on the international community to take urgent measures to eradicate acts of violence against detained women, including better reporting on this problem.

Under the agenda items relating to the results of the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, and program of future work, the Commission adopted three consensus resolutions of singular importance to the future effectiveness of the CSW and the implementation of the Forward-Looking Strategies.

The first of these, on the program of future work of the Commission, was inspired by texts originally submitted by the United States and Canada. The resolution decided to convene an extraordinary session of the CSW in 1987 to consider the following:

(a) revisions to the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989 intended to fully integrate the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women into both economic and social development programs;

(b) proposals for the preparation by the Secretariat of the medium-term plan for the period 1990-1995;

(c) program narrative of the proposed program budget for the biennium 1988-1989;

(d) final draft of the system-wide medium-term plan for women and development;

(e) monitoring, review and appraisal of the Forward-Looking Strategies with a view to facilitating their expeditious and universal application;

(f) proposed guidelines for the long-term program of work of the Commission to the year 2000; and

(g) proposals for the strengthening of the Commission in discharging its functions.

The U.S. Representative, Ms. Reagan, indicated that the United States regarded this resolution as a step toward the reordering of UN priorities in favor of concrete programs for the advancement of women and toward annual sessions of the Commission. It was understood that the extraordinary session of the Commission in 1987 would address the issue of annualization.

A draft resolution on the system-wide medium-term plan for women and development and system-wide coordination of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women emphasized the importance of the comprehensive implementation of the Forward-Looking Strategies and decided that the CSW would review the final draft of the system-wide medium-term plan for women and development (1990-1995) before its consideration by the Economic and Social Council at its Second Regular Session of 1987.

The Commission also adopted a consensus resolution promoting national machinery for the advancement of women.

A draft resolution to change the name of the CSW to the Commission for Women's Advancement was withdrawn by France for lack of support.

FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council considered the question of the advancement of women May 13-15 and May 20, 1986, when voting took place. All Council

resolutions and decisions were in the form of recommendations to the UN General Assembly and were subject to General Assembly approval.

The Second Committee had before it the report of the Commission on its 31st Session, the report of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women on its sixth Session and related documents.

Of the 17 draft resolutions recommended by the report of the Commission on the Status of Women, the Council adopted 10 by consensus and 5 by vote, and delayed consideration of 2.

The drafts adopted by consensus included the elimination of discrimination against women and exercise of all their rights; violence in the family; women in the United Nations; participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation; elderly women; the role of women in society; implementation of the Arusha Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of African Women Beyond the UN Decade For Women; physical violence against detained women that is specific to their sex; and national machinery to promote the advancement of women.

The Representative of Belgium, on behalf of a group of co-sponsors including the United States, introduced a draft resolution entitled, "Implications of the Forward-Looking Strategies for the Program Planning System and the Program of Future Work of the Commission on the Status of Women" to replace draft resolution E/CN.6/1986/L.28 of the CSW entitled, "Program of Future Work of the Commission on the Status of Women." The new draft retained the major elements of the original text, i.e., the decision to convene an extraordinary session of the CSW in 1987 to consider a far-reaching program of future work. It differed in reducing the duration of the 1987 session from eight to five working days and transferring the session from Vienna to New York. These changes were necessary to contain the cost of the extraordinary session. The new draft also included the provisional agenda of the 1987 session.

Five draft resolutions were adopted by the Second Committee by vote. These were the same resolutions to which Western Delegations, including the United States, had objected at the 31st Session of the CSW on the grounds that they were politicized. The votes were as follows: Palestinian women, 44 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions; women and children under apartheid, 44 to 2 (U.S., U.K.), with 6 abstentions; Namibia, 44 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions; Front-Line States, 42 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions; and measures of assistance provided to South African, Namibian and refugee women 43 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions.

Consideration of CSW resolutions on updating the World Survey on the Role of Women in Development and on the system-wide medium-term plan for women and development and system-wide coordination of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women was deferred until the Second Regular Session of 1986 of the Economic and Social Council.

The Second Committee of ECOSOC also adopted a consensus resolution on the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women which, *inter alia*, commended the work of the Institute and renewed the appeal to governments, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations and other potential donors to contribute to the Trust Fund for the Institute.

At its May 23d plenary session, the Economic and Social Council considered the draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee. The Committee's consensus recommendations were endorsed, also by consensus. Votes were taken on the five politicized resolutions, which were adopted, with the following results: Palestinian women, 44 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions (Resolution 1986/21); women and children under apartheid, 44 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions (Resolution 1986/22); Namibia, 44 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions (Resolution 1986/23); Front-Line States, 43 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions (Resolution 1986/24); and measures of assistance provided to South African, Namibian and refugee women, 43 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 1986/25) The plenary also decided to defer consideration of CSW resolutions on updating the World Survey and on the system-wide medium-term plan until the Second Regular Session of 1986.

One-third of the CSW's membership is rotated every year, with the election of new members held at the First Regular Session of the Economic and Social Council. The U.S. four-year term expired in 1986. It sought reelection to continue the leadership role played by the U.S. Representative, Ms. Reagan, in the rejuvenation of UN programs and machinery for the advancement of women.

The Council elected the following members by acclamation: Ivory Coast, Gabon and Zaire (African Group); Bangladesh and Philippines (Asian Group); Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union (Eastern European Group); and Mexico (Latin American Group). Italy, the United States, and Australia were elected by secret ballot to represent the Western Group; a vote was necessary because there were more Western candidates than Western seats. The new term of the United States runs until 1990.

SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The First (Economic) Committee of ECOSOC considered the question of effective mobilization and integration of women in development July 3, 4, 9, and 16, 1986. The Committee had before it the report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its 31st Session.

The Committee considered the draft resolution recommended by the Commission entitled, "Updating of the World Survey on the Role of Women in Development." The draft was adopted by consensus with several amendments.

The Representative of Canada introduced a draft resolution entitled, "Strengthening the work of the United Nations in integrating women effectively in economic development programs and activities," which, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary-General and the Director General for Development and International Economic Cooperation to propose recommendations for the implementation of Chapter Two of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies relating to development issues and policies, energy, the environment, food and agriculture, human settlements, industrial development, international trade and development, finance, natural resources, science and technology, statistics, transport and communications, and to take these economic issues into account in the preparation of UN medium-term plans. The Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus with several amendments.

At its July 23d plenary session, the Economic and Social Council considered the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee. Both drafts recommended by the Committee were adopted by consensus.

On July 18th, the Third (Program and Coordination) Committee of the Economic and Social Council considered the system-wide medium-term plan for women and development and system-wide coordination of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women. The Committee adopted by consensus the draft resolution of the same title recommended by the Commission on the Status of Women at its 31st Session.

At its July 22d plenary session, the Economic and Social Council endorsed the above resolution on the system-wide medium-term plan, also by consensus. (Resolution 1986/71)

FORTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee of the General Assembly considered issues of special concern to

women under agenda item 12, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council"; item 92, "Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women"; and item 93, "Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women to the Year 2000", on October 23, 24, 27, 29, and 30 and November 6, 11 and 13. The Committee had before it the report of the Economic and Social Council on its First and Second Regular Sessions of 1986, the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the report of the Secretary-General on the UN Development Fund for Women, the report of the Secretary General on the incorporation of the interests of women in the work program of the regional commissions, the report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women and related documents.

The U.S. Representative to the CSW and Special Adviser to the U.S. Delegation to the 41st Session of the General Assembly, Ms. Reagan, made a statement reiterating the U.S. goal of strengthening UN machinery and programs for the advancement of women. She called upon the General Assembly to ratify the steps toward this objective taken earlier in 1986 by the Commission on the Status of Women and the Economic and Social Council. She said, "Fifteen months have passed since the close of the United Nations Conference on Women in Nairobi. It is now time for action. It is time to transform the strategies adopted at Nairobi into concrete programs in the service of women. In the private sector and at the local and national governmental levels others have this responsibility. But at the international level, it is up to us to take action and to provide leadership . . ."

The Committee considered four draft resolutions recommended to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council. The resolutions were entitled, "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women" (41/108), "Participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation" (41/109), "The role of women in society" (41/110), and "Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women" (41/111). They were all adopted without a vote.

The U.S. Representative in the Third Committee, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, made a statement relative to the resolution on "The role of women in society." She said that even though the U.S. Delegation had chosen not to break the consensus, it had reservations about the draft. The list of factors preventing women from participating fully in the decision making process in their

countries, in the ninth preambular paragraph, was a set of Marxist clichés, which the United States could not accept. The draft failed to mention genuine factors limiting women's participation in the decision making process such as the absence of civil and political liberties in a number of societies. The U.S. Representative added that, with regard to operative paragraph four, while some individuals in the United States had accepted the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, the policy of the Federal Government was that of equal pay for equal work.

The report of the Secretary-General on the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) discussed the work of the Fund as a catalyst for women's involvement in mainstream development activities and as a support for innovative and experimental activities benefitting women. The Committee decided to take note of the report.

At its December 4 session, the General Assembly plenary considered the four draft resolutions and the draft decision recommended to it by the Third Committee. The resolutions and the decision were adopted without a vote.

At its December 11 session, the General Assembly plenary turned to agenda item 117 entitled, "Personnel Questions." It considered a draft resolution (41/206D) regarding the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat. That resolution requested the Secretary-General to include in his report to the 42d (1987) Session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the action program for the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat the following information, distributed by region and degree of representation, for the two-year period 1985-1986:

(a) The number of promotions, including in particular, accelerated and *ad hoc* promotions, of men and women in posts subject to geographical distribution, as well as the average length of time-in-grade of these staff members at the moment of promotion;

(b) The distribution by department or office and by grade of women in technical cooperation posts at the beginning and the end of the period;

(c) The distribution of women consultants engaged during the period by field of activity and length of contract;

(d) The number of men and women participating in the work of personnel advisory boards such as appointment and promotion bodies, appeals boards, disciplinary committees, grievance panels, classification review bodies, and other joint staff-management bodies.

The resolution was adopted without a vote.

On the same date, the General Assembly plenary adopted the report of the Economic and Social Council entitled, "Advancement of Women," which included Chapter 5 (Section C) of the draft resolution "Implementation of the Forward-Looking Strate-

gies for the Program Planning System and the Program of Future Work of the CSW." This resolution, *inter alia*, decided to convene an extraordinary session of the CSW in 1987 to consider a far-reaching program of future work. Thus, the stage was set in 1987 for the institutionalization of proposals made by the U.S. Representative to the CSW, Ms. Reagan, following the Nairobi World Conference on Women, including the annualization of CSW meetings.

EXPERT GROUP MEETING ON VIOLENCE IN THE FAMILY

In response to Economic and Social Council Resolution 1984/14, the UN Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs convened an expert group meeting on violence in the family with special emphasis on its effects on women at the Vienna International Center December 8-12, 1986. The meeting was attended by 29 experts from 24 countries, with observers from Member States of the United Nations, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations.

The U.S. expert was Ms. Lois Haight Herrington, who presented a case study under the agenda item on "Forms of crisis intervention and types of immediate and structural measures to render assistance to women assaulted in the family."

Dr. Badria Abdullah Al-Awadhi (Kuwait) was elected chairperson of the meeting and Ms. Jane Frances Connors (U.K.) general rapporteur. (Ms. Connors left the meeting early and was replaced by Ms. Diane Wood of Canada.)

The issue of domestic violence is highlighted in the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies, which calls for the intensification of efforts to establish or strengthen all forms of assistance to victims and to increase public awareness and understanding of violence against women as a societal program. The experts' recommendations for action to be taken in concert by governments, intergovernmental organizations, the UN system, nongovernmental organizations, research institutions, and professional societies and individuals, thus constituted a significant input to the continuing work of the Commission on the Status of Women and the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control in implementing this part of the Forward-Looking Strategies.

Specialized Agencies

WORLD BANK GROUP

The World Bank Group is composed of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). As a member of the UN system and as a development finance institution, the World Bank works with the United Nations and its various specialized agencies in a wide variety of activities. During the Bank Group's fiscal year 1986 (FY 86), ending June 30, 1986, Tonga and Poland joined the IBRD, bringing Bank membership to 150. A membership application was pending for Kiribati at year end. Tonga joined IDA, bringing membership to 134; membership was pending for Kiribati, Portugal, and St. Christopher and Nevis. Tonga took up membership in the IFC during the year, bringing membership to a total of 128 countries.

The Bank lends to stimulate economic growth in its member countries by providing funds either at near-commercial terms or at highly concessional terms for sound projects. Traditionally, the Bank has financed all types of capital infrastructure, but in 1980, the Bank inaugurated a program of structural adjustment lending to support specific policy changes and institutional reforms in developing countries. Structural and sectoral adjustment, so-called program loans, accounted for 14 percent of total IBRD/IDA lending in FY 86.

IDA AND IBRD FY 1985 LENDING PROGRAM

The IBRD approved \$13.179 billion loans for FY 86 to support 131 projects in 41 countries, a 16 percent increase over FY 85. IDA credits amounted to \$3.140 billion, up 4 percent from the previous year, for 97 projects in 37 countries.

IBRD lending was less than planned because problems faced by borrowers and the requirement of prudent financial management limited IBRD operations.

IDA credits are concentrated in the poorest countries with an annual per capita income of \$790 (1984 dollars) or less. In the 4-year period FY 83-86, 95 percent of IDA lending went to countries which currently have annual per capita incomes below \$400 (1984 dollars).

Total IBRD and IDA commitments in FY 86 had the following sectoral composition:

<i>U.S. Dollar Dollars Percentage Sector</i>	<i>(Mil- lions)</i>	<i>(Round- ed)</i>
Agriculture and Rural Development	4,777.4	29.3
Development Finance Companies	1,449.2	8.9
Education	829.2	5.1
Energy	—	—
Oil, Coal, and Gas	231.1	1.4
Power	2,786.9	17.1
Industry	821.1	5.0
Nonproject	1,321.0	8.1
Population, Health, and Nutrition	419.5	2.6
Small-Scale Enterprise	274.5	1.7
Technical Assistance	137.9	0.8
Telecommunications	50.4	0.3
Transportation	1,498.2	9.2
Urban Development	1,117.5	6.8
Water Supply and Sewerage	604.8	3.7
<i>TOTAL</i>	16,318.7	100.0

Projects approved by the IBRD and IDA during FY 86 had the following regional distribution:

<i>U.S. Dollars</i>	<i>Dollar</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>No. Millions Percent- age</i>
Eastern Africa	41	915.9	5.6
Western Africa	38	1,130.6	6.9
East Asia and Pacific	44	3,565.2	21.8
South Asia	32	3,631.0	22.3
Europe, Middle East, and North Africa	30	2,304.8	14.1
Latin American and Caribbean	43	4,771.2	29.2
<i>TOTAL</i>	228	16,318.7	100.0

Barber Conable became the seventh president of the World Bank effective July 1, 1986, replacing A.W. Clausen who had served as President for five years.

The World Bank's Board of Governors with U.S. support, approved a draft Convention for the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). There are now more than 50 signatories to the Convention, including the United States, but the organization can not be activated until member countries make their contribu-

tions. MIGA, which has as its goal increasing private investment flows to developing countries, is endowed with authority to issue guarantees against noncommercial risk though a wide range of technical assistance and consultative activities.

During fiscal year 1986, the Special Facility for sub-Saharan Africa, created in May 1985, approved 22 operations totaling \$782 million. These operations were in support of countries that had undertaken, or were committed to undertake, appropriate medium-term programs of policy reform.

Negotiations for the eighth replenishment of IDA began in fiscal year 1986.

IBRD borrowings, which are the principal source of funds for its lending operations, reached \$10.6 billion, down slightly from \$11.1 billion in FY 85. The largest operations were in United States, Japanese, German and Swiss currencies.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The IFC assists the economic development of its borrowing member countries by making loans to, and equity investments in, productive enterprises in the private sector; by bringing together investment opportunities, domestic and foreign private capital, and experienced management; by helping to develop local and regional capital markets; and by promoting privately-owned development finance corporations. Projects are selected on the basis of financial viability and their contribution to economic development.

The IFC approved \$1.156 billion for 85 projects in 39 countries in FY 86. The dollar value of the investments approved for IFC's own account rose by \$101 million, or 17 percent. Twenty four of the financing operations, valued at \$107 million, were in sub-Saharan Africa.

International Monetary Fund

Use of IMF resources continued to decline in 1986 as the world economy achieved moderate growth in its fourth year of sustained recovery. Drawings on IMF loans totaled Special Drawing Rights (SDR) 13.8 billion in 1986, a slight decline from 14 billion in 1985. Drawings had peaked at SDR 13.2 billion in 1983, falling to SDR 7.3 billion in 1984. New loan commitments rose slightly to SDR 3.7 billion from SDR 3.3 billion in 1985.

The SDR is the unit of account used by the IMF. A composite of the U.S. dollar, French franc, German mark, British pound sterling and Japanese yen, the SDR was worth \$1.22 on December 31, 1986. The average value of the SDR in 1986 was \$1.17.

Aggregate IMF credit outstanding at the end of 1986 showed an absolute decline for the first time since 1980, falling by SDR 1.8 billion to a level of SDR 33.3 billion. This decline is not solely attributable to improved economic performance, but results as well from net repayments on the high level of IMF lending extended from 1982-4 which coincided with a major world recession and the onset of the debt crisis.

In spite of improved growth in many developing countries, developments in the international economy in 1986 were mixed. Many developing countries continued to face debt servicing problems and arrears to the IMF continued to increase, reaching an unprecedented total of SDR 1036.5 billion of which close to 80% were overdue more than 3 months.

As in recent years, only developing countries borrowed IMF resources. Of the total drawings, 82 percent were made under standby and extended programs. These programs, developed jointly by a member country and the IMF, aim to achieve balance of payments viability in the medium term as the basis for sustainable noninflationary growth. Throughout 1986, a major new trend in adjustment programs emerged as the IMF increasingly emphasized near-term growth in its program design. In 1986 the IMF approved 20 new standby programs compared with 25 standby and 1 extended program approved in 1985. At the end of 1986, 31 standby and one extended program were active, compared with 29 standby and 3 extended programs active at the end of 1985.

Drawings under the special-purpose Compensatory Financing Facility (CFF) amounted to SDR 0.6 billion in 1986, a slight decrease from SDR 0.9 billion in 1985. The CFF is available to members facing payment difficulties resulting from temporary shortfalls in export earnings or surges in food import costs that are due largely to conditions beyond the member's control. Over the last three years, drawings under this facility have averaged SDR 0.6 billion per annum, a significant decline from average drawings of SDR 2.1 billion in the three preceding years. CFF drawings accounted for approximately 15 percent of total drawings in 1986, compared with a peak of 35 percent in 1982.

In recent years the IMF has recognized that its medium-term resources are not well-suited to addressing entrenched structural problems which are often at the root of countries' balance of payments difficulties. In the case of the poorest countries, successive

medium-term loans have added to debt servicing problems that lead to prolonged use of IMF resources which are intended to be temporary. To address this problem, in 1986 the IMF began a major new initiative by creating the Structural Adjustment Facility (SAF). This facility operates in tandem with World Bank (IBRD) programs under a framework jointly developed by eligible members with the two organizations. Financed by repayment of loans extended in the 1970's from the IMF Trust Fund, SAF loans support three-year adjustment programs. The longer duration of SAF programs and their repayment at concessional interest rates over five years, after a five year grace period, allows beneficiaries to undertake major long-term policy reform to provide a basis for sustained growth. SAF resources are intended to be augmented by IBRD policy-based loans and by bilateral assistance from donor nations. In 1986 the IMF approved nine SAF programs with total commitments of SDR 192 million of which SDR 82 million was disbursed during the year. Total SAF loans could approach SDR 2.75 billion over the next five years.

In late 1986 the Managing Director of the IMF Jacques de Larosiere announced his intention to retire at the end of the year, two years before the end of his second six-year term. Traditionally, the candidate for Managing Director has been nominated by European members. In December, Michel Camdessus, at the time Governor of the Bank of France, was elected unanimously. He began his term in January 1987.

Membership in the IMF rose to 151 countries in 1986 with the accession of Poland and Kiribati. With the exception of the Soviet Union and several Eastern European countries, most developed and developing countries are members of the IMF.

International Fund for Agricultural Development

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) was founded in 1977 with strong leadership from the United States. IFAD's mandate is to increase food production in the developing countries through loans for projects benefiting small farmers and landless poor. IFAD has been financed by roughly equal contributions from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). IFAD has a unique governing structure which accords the three groups of members—OECD (Category I), OPEC (Category II), and non-OPEC developing countries (Category III)—equal numbers of votes.

During the Ninth Session of the IFAD Governing Council in Rome, January 18-21, 1986, negotiations between Category I and

Category II culminated in an agreement to create a second replenishment (IFAD II) at a level of \$460 million on the basis of a 60 percent OECD (\$276 million)—40 percent OPEC (\$184 million) burden sharing formula. This result was the product of two and a half years of negotiations. The U.S. contribution will be \$79,840,000 or 17 percent of the total.

The Governing Council (with U.S. support) passed a resolution which instructed the president to convene a group of experts to examine options for making IFAD's resource base more predictable and secure. The result, called "The President's Report on IFAD's Future Financial Basis and Structure," was circulated to members later in the year. The donors are using the ideas presented in the report as a basis for discussion. The experts examined seventeen options but did not recommend a particular course of action.

During the December 1986 session of the Governing Council, several members expressed general views on the subject. A number of OECD countries stated that the present partnership must be preserved in any future configuration of IFAD's financial basis. Some OPEC nations dissented, saying that, because of the current financial difficulties of many OPEC countries, the concept of approximately equal burden sharing must be revised. The Council established a Group of 36 (12 members from each category) to study the report and to submit recommendations to the January 1988 session of the Council. Also, the Council amended the IFAD Articles of Agreement to extend the term of the President from 3 to 4 years. Additionally, the United States announced a \$10 million contribution to IFAD's special program for sub-Saharan countries affected by drought and desertification.

During 1986 IFAD approved 20 projects for approximately \$122 million and 17 technical assistance grants and loans worth approximately \$5 million. Total loans and grants in operation equaled approximately \$160 million.

The Key Officers are:

Idriss Jazairy (Algeria), President

Donald Brown (U.S.), Vice President

Moise Mensah (Benin) Assistant President, Project Management Department

Gordon Munson (U.S.), Chief of Administrative Services

Mohiuddun Alangir (U.S.), Senior Adviser to President

The World Food Program

Since its establishment in 1963, the World Food Program (WFP) has been the principal vehicle within the UN system for distributing food aid. The FAO and the United Nations jointly sponsor WFP. WFP distributes food commodities supplied by donor countries to support development projects designed to produce social and economic progress. WFP also provides emergency food assistance in response to natural and man-made disasters. Development projects consume approximately three-quarters of WFP resources, and emergency projects the remainder. WFP also administers the International Emergency Food Reserve which provides commodities for emergencies (including refugee feeding) only.

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs (CFA) is the governing body of WFP. The CFA is composed of 30 members, elected for three-year terms, with 10 new members elected annually to replace 10 retiring members. ECOSOC elects half of these and the FAO Council elects the remaining five. The United States (as the largest donor) and some other major donors are regularly reelected to the CFA. At the November 1986 meeting of the FAO Council, the United States was reelected to the CFA for a term beginning January 1, 1987.

The CFA meets twice a year to review WFP projects and resource commitments and to discuss WFP program and budgetary issues. WFP operates on a two-year cycle for budgeting, programming and planning purposes. Donors pledge resources to WFP on a biennial basis. WFP's pledging target for 1985-1986 was \$1.35 billion. The \$250 million pledge by the United States for 1985-1986 maintains the previous level of support shown in the 1983-1984 biennium. The pledge consists of up to \$151 million in commodities, \$45 million in cash to cover transportation costs under PL 480 Title II, and \$50 million in commodities and cash for freight costs supplied under Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1979. Also, the pledge included an additional \$4 million cash contribution to WFP's administrative budget under the Foreign Assistance Act.

During the 21st Session of the CFA, which met in Rome from May 26 to June 6, 1986, the Committee approved 17 new or expanded projects and 5 project budget increases, totaling \$276 million, equivalent to 811,000 MT of food aid. In his opening statement to the CFA, Executive Director James C. Ingram concentrated on matters relating to Africa. He said that massive starvation had been averted through food aid imports, but that food shortages there would continue unless there was a revolution in the

way African governments and the international community dealt with agricultural development needs. The Executive Director said that food aid was too important a resource not to be focused on promoting self-reliance.

In a joint statement, the WFP Executive Director and the FAO Director General emphasized the practical value of the contributions that Non-Governmental Organizations and individuals make toward food security. They urged African countries to reorder their economic priorities substantially in order to afford agriculture greater importance. The statement also noted the importance of early warning systems and stockpiling of food aid commodities. USAID Administrator M. Peter McPherson addressed the 22d Session of the CFA on lessons learned from the African drought. McPherson underlined the key role of the private sector, including NGOs, in responding to the drought. He also stressed the importance of an early warning system, special expertise, and rapid funding mechanisms.

In the CFA debate, the U.S. Delegation supported increased attention to monitoring and accountability of projects, and urged that the CFA only authorize limited food monetization in individual cases after careful review of the specific country situation.

The Executive Director reported that the consulting firm of McKinsey and Co. had begun to study ways to improve WFP's management and that their conclusions would be presented to the next session of the CFA.

The 22d session of the CFA was held, October 20-31, 1986. The Committee approved 20 new projects totaling \$298 million. WFP reported that, during the first six months of 1986, it had provided emergency assistance to 19 countries of 223,000 MT of food, at a cost to WFP of \$76 million; 73 per cent of the food was committed to refugees. Administration of "Operation Rainbow," providing food aid to Sudan, had been extremely difficult. The CFA addressed the problems of southern African Front Line states which depend on South African rail links for delivery of food aid.

FAO Director General Saouma announced, at that CFA, that he and the UN Secretary-General had reappointed James Ingram to a second five-year term as WFP Executive Director, to begin April 1, 1987.

The McKinsey report on WFP's management was also presented. It called for a major reorganization of WFP and a shift of emphasis from headquarters to the field. The Executive Director welcomed the report but stated that he would present his recommendations concerning its implementation at the 23d and 24th

sessions of the CFA. Several CFA members expressed concern about the budgetary implications of the report. The U.S. Delegation expressed satisfaction with the professional quality of the report but stated that the U.S. Government would wish to consider the Executive Director's views in determining its response to the McKinsey recommendations. The United States raised three areas of concern: 1) the extent to which WFP should be involved in providing program, rather than project, food aid; 2) improving the CFA's governance of WFP; and 3) the budgetary implications of increasing the size of the WFP's staff.

Evaluation of the 1984-85 African emergency led to the conclusion that the international community had been late in recognizing the gravity and magnitude of the crisis. The U.S. Delegation described measures the United States was taking to ensure that the international community strengthen its response to future emergencies.

Concerning monetization of food aid, the United States supported those delegates who contended that, because a fundamental policy question was at stake, WFP should prepare a policy paper for full review at the next CFA and delay the submission of further projects involving substantial monetization pending its consideration. The Executive Director agreed to this course of action.

Food and Agriculture Organization

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), one of the largest UN specialized agencies, is the lead international organization in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, and forestry. FAO's agriculture program attempts to bring about a sustained global improvement in nutrition levels, food security, and rural incomes, especially for the disadvantaged, through increasing rural productivity. Its fisheries program promotes improved management and utilization of the world's fishery resources, particularly by helping developing countries to increase their capacity to manage their marine and inland fisheries. The FAO forestry program, the smallest of the three, assists member countries to balance the growing demand for forest goods and services and increasing pressures of agriculture on forest land against environmental concerns. These FAO goals are consistent with the aims of U.S. bilateral development assistance programs.

FAO is governed by its Conference, to which all the member states of the organization belong. This body meets biennially in odd-numbered years to review FAO's works and to adopt the Pro-

gram of Work and Budget for the coming two years. Between Conference sessions, the 49-member FAO Council directs the work of the organization. In even-numbered years, there are regional conferences in each of FAO's five geographical regions and a fall session of the Council. FAO is unusual among specialized agencies in that the Soviet Union does not belong to it.

FAO COUNCIL

The 90th Session of the FAO Council took place in Rome, November 17 to November 28, 1986. The 90th Session was the Council's first in the 1986-1987 biennium. The issue of chief concern to the Council was the financial crisis resulting from the delay by the United States in paying its assessment.

The Council elected five members, including the United States, to three-year terms on the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs, the governing body of the World Food Program. The Council considered a report of the 48th Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal matters (CCLM) which included procedures for election of members to the Finance Committee. The United States argued that the North American region should be assured membership on the Finance Committee to provide just and equitable geographic representation and to recognize the fact that the United States and Canada are two of the largest donors to the FAO. The Council took no decision but requested the CCLM to consider the question further.

The Council set April 3, 1987, as the deadline date for the receipt for nominations for candidates for the election of the FAO Director General.

THE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

The 18th Regional Conference for the Near East was held in Istanbul, March 17-21, 1986. The region's dependence on food imports and vulnerability to economic instability were major concerns. There were repeated calls for increased FAO expenditures on drybed farming techniques and research into seed varieties suitable to the area's arid climate. The Conference concluded that improvement of seed varieties was the single most important factor increasing agricultural output.

The 15th Regional Conference for Europe was also held in Istanbul, Turkey, April 28-May 2, 1986. Opening statements dealt with problems of agricultural surpluses. There was agreement on the desirability of protecting European forestry and combatting pollution. Delegations spoke for and against agricultural protec-

tionism. General discussion focused on the role of the FAO and the means by which it could be made a more effective and efficient organization.

The Regional Conference for Asia and the Pacific held its 18th Session, July 8-17, 1986, in Rome. This is the only Regional Conference in which the United States participates as a full member. Items on the agenda for this meeting included food security, institutional credits for farmers, women in agriculture, and agricultural research. Twenty-four members attended including two new members: Iran and the Cook Islands. The U.S. Delegation reported that FAO field activities expanded in the region to include 753 projects, including 71 regional and 622 country level projects. Most projects were in the crop sector, followed by forestry and natural resources. Investment support activities through FAO's Investment Center resulted in the approval of 18 projects valued at \$915 million by multilateral lending institutions. Priority areas for FAO work in the region include: 1) promotion of technical cooperation among developing countries in the region; 2) promotion of equity along with growth in agricultural development programs; 3) development of rain-fed agriculture; 4) diversification of the agricultural economies of developing countries; 5) agricultural development of the small island countries and the region.

The 19th Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean Conference met in Barbados, August 5-13, 1986. The Conference endorsed a proposal for FAO to undertake a study of the future of agriculture in the area. It considered the role of women in rural development, helping the small farmer, and aquaculture and rural development.

The 14th African Regional Conference took place in the Cote d'Ivoire, Sept. 2-11, 1986. FAO's study, *African Agriculture: The Next 25 Years*, was presented to the Conference and was largely applauded as a comprehensive document, but perhaps too optimistic as to what Africa could accomplish by the year 2010. Most countries are increasing investment in agriculture and progressing toward the 20-25% figure of total development investment agreed to by the OAU Summit. There was a consensus that there should be increased food production in the region and reduced emphasis on export crops.

OTHER MEETINGS

The FAO Finance Committee held its 57th Session May 12-23, 1986, and 58th Session, September 22-Oct. 3, 1986. The FAO Secretariat and membership became increasingly concerned

during the course of the year about the organization's financial situation. Three major factors prevented FAO from adhering to its budget projections: the U.S. dollar's fall against other major currencies; a drop in interest rates which reduced miscellaneous income, and delays by the United States and other countries in paying assessments. FAO suggested various ways to deal with the situation including a drawdown of the working capital fund, foregoing the 1984-1985 cash surplus distribution, and a proposed downward adjustment in expenditures including reductions in personnel.

Representatives from 21 countries met in Rome, June 2-3, for the first meeting of the Working Group of the FAO Commission on Plant Genetics Resources (IBPGR). Because of its opposition to the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources and to the Commission, the United States did not participate in the Working Group.

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

The United States maintained Observer Status with UNESCO during 1986. The U.S. Observer Mission observes reform at UNESCO, and works with Secretariat officials and diplomats accredited to UNESCO to encourage these reforms within the Organization. In May 1986, it moved its offices in Paris to the main U.S. Embassy building.

The mandate of the Reform Observation Panel (ROP) for UNESCO was extended for another year. The Panel was established in 1985 "to assess and report on the UNESCO reform process and to encourage reform efforts that advance continuing U.S. interests." Mr. Leonard Marks continued to serve as Chairman and Mr. Franklyn Nofziger as Vice-Chairman. The Panel met once during 1986 and its Chairman attended the Spring (124th) and Fall (125th) sessions of the Executive Board. The Panel did not identify reforms sufficient to warrant a review of the U.S. decision to withdraw from UNESCO.

During the Fall session of the Executive Board, Director General M'Bow announced that he would not seek a third term as Director General at the end of his term of office in November 1987. The Chairman of the Executive Board, Dr. Ivo Margan, initiated the search procedures for a new Director General. After examining the qualifications of candidates proposed by Member States, the Executive Board will propose one candidate for election to the

Director Generalship by the 24th General Conference (Paris, October-November 1987).

During 1986 the United States remained a party to the following UNESCO-related international conventions:

—The Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural character, with Protocol (Beirut Agreement), done at Lake Success, July 15, 1949;

—The Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, with Protocol, (Florence Agreement), done at Lake Success, November 22, 1950;

—The Universal Copyright Convention and Protocols 1, 2 and 3 Annexed thereto, done at Geneva, September 6, 1952;

—The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, adopted at Paris, December 3, 1958;

—The Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its Sixteenth Session on November 14, 1970;

—The Universal Copyright Convention as revised at Paris on July 24, 1971, and Protocols 1 and 2 Annexed thereto, adopted on July 14, 1971, by an International Conference of States Convened by UNESCO;

—The Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms done at Geneva, October 29, 1971; and

—The Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage done at Paris, November 16, 1972.

The United States also participated in the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC); and the International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP). The regulations governing these UNESCO-related bodies formally allow participation of non-UNESCO member states.

The United States made voluntary contributions of \$1.228 million to these intergovernmental bodies as well as to selected international scientific or cultural activities in UNESCO's fields of competence considered important to United States interests. In the past, financing for these purposes was provided by U.S. annual contributions to UNESCO. Among other bodies or activities funded were the Universal Copyright and related conventions (in process), the Man and the Biosphere Program, and the U.S. National Committee of the International Council on Monuments

and Sites. A separate contribution was made to the World Heritage Fund.

World Heritage Convention

During 1986, State Parties to the International Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage increased to 91, and 31 additional sites were added to the World Heritage List. The United States submitted nominations for inclusion of two sites on the list: Thomas Jefferson Thematic Monticello and the University of Virginia, and Pu'uhonua o Honanau National Historical Park, Hawaii. The Statue of Liberty was officially dedicated as a site in October by Interior Secretary Hodel. In addition, the World Heritage emblems and the terms "World Heritage Convention" and "World Heritage Committee" were registered under U.S. law and their use restricted for purposes officially connected with the Convention. In November a U.S. Observer Delegation attended the Tenth Session of the World Heritage Committee to show U.S. interest in reelection to this governing body. A voluntary contribution of \$239,000 was made to the World Heritage Fund for assistance and preservation of the 247 designated sites in 55 countries.

International Geological Correlation Program

The International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP) is a cooperative effort by the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS) and UNESCO to encourage international research on geological problems related to the identification and assessment of natural resources and the improvement of man's environment. There are currently 56 active (funded) projects and 11 projects on an "extended term" status (not funded, but listed and results reported). IGCP project activities in the United States are guided and coordinated by the United States National Committee for IGCP, organized in 1974 as a subcommittee of the U.S. National Committee on Geology.

The focus of IGCP affairs in the United States is the project working group. Twenty-three U.S. working groups, each consisting of 3 to 10 or more scientists, have been organized. The most recent IGCP projects have had leaders in developing countries, and this has given United States scientists the opportunity to pursue geological investigations in areas that were previously not accessible because of lack of scientific counterparts. In 1986, 23 meetings were held, more than a dozen publications were completed, and 3 training courses were given.

One of the most active IGCP projects for the last several years has been the working group on phosphorites. Its purpose is to stimulate scientific research on and provide training in the area of sedimentary phosphorites. Another recently approved IGCP project promotes the study of non-marine Cretaceous correlation, focusing on problems of stratigraphy and geologic history of cretaceous basins. During 1986, the project sponsored an international symposium, two organizational meetings, and a research coordination meeting. Other projects include research on mineral and energy resources, comparison of active faults, and design and generation of a world data base for igneous petrology.

Universal Copyright Convention

The International Copyright activities of UNESCO, conducted primarily in association with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), addressed a variety of issues of importance to American copyright interests.

In January 1986, model provisions for national laws on employed authors were considered at an experts meeting. The provisions provide a framework for national legislation concerning the rights and obligations of employee authors and their employers in the case of works protected by copyright and created in the course of employment.

A committee of governmental experts met in June 1986 to discuss the various copyright and neighboring rights issues regarding audio-visual works and phonograms with a view to arriving at certain principles. Although the principles have no binding force, taken together with comments from the meeting, they will provide guidance to national legislators in establishment of rules providing adequate protection for owners rights, especially with regard to the new forms of exploitation of audio-visual works and phonograms.

A committee of governmental experts on works of visual arts met in December 1986 to discuss the various copyright issues arising in relation to works of visual art with a view to devising certain principles which, together with comments from the meeting, give guidance to governments dealing with those issues.

Man and The Biosphere Program (MAB)

During 1986, U.S. scientists as individuals and as members of the United States Man and the Biosphere Program continued to collaborate with the UNESCO MAB Program and with other programs and agencies of the United Nations. During 1986, U.S. MAB granted funds (which were made available through the vol-

untary contributions section of the Foreign Assistance Act) to support the participation of U.S. scientists on several UNESCO MAB international advisory panels. These U.S. scientists played key leadership roles on these panels which produced recommendations to strengthen the international MAB Program. The recommendations were adopted by the MAB International Coordinating Council (ICC), to which the U.S. MAB Program sent an observer delegation. The adoption of the U.S.-initiated recommendations resulted in:

- refocusing UNESCO MAB's research program into four new thematic areas of how humans affect their environment;
- restructuring the MAB Secretariat;
- changing the training program to an *in situ* emphasis;
- utilizing commercial publishers for MAB publications; and
- selecting international research projects through the use of scientific peer review methods.

In 1986 U.S. MAB also provided a senior U.S. scientist to work in the UNESCO MAB Secretariat in areas of key U.S. interest such as the emerging International Geosphere-Biosphere Program, temperate forestry and ecology issues, and the development of the Northern Science Network. He, along with another U.S. scientist, on sabbatical from a U.S. university, provided U.S. scientific leadership within the international MAB Program.

These U.S. scientists have organized several workshops under UNESCO auspices. The proposals resulting from them have been endorsed by the Scientific Council On Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), and the International Limnological Congress. Also a working relationship is being established between UNESCO MAB and the International Geosphere-Biosphere Program (IGBP).

The U.S. MAB Program also collaborated with the MAB programs of UNESCO and those of other countries, as well as with other UN agencies, in cosponsoring and co-funding an Interoceanic Workshop on Environmental Management and Sustained Development of Small Islands. This workshop took place in Puerto Rico and was also supported by the UN's Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the MAB programs of Canada, Spain, Yugoslavia, Japan and China.

In 1986 UNESCO MAB provided some initial funds for the establishment of a U.S. MAB-sponsored program on Biological Diversity at the Smithsonian Institution.

The U.S. and UNESCO MAB programs cosponsored and co-funded the interchange of a U.S. Delegation to attend the International Symposium on Temperate Forest Ecosystem Management and Environment Protection at Changbai, China, and a China delegation to attend the IV International Congress of Ecology at Syracuse, New York.

Finally, the UNESCO MAB Program assisted U.S. MAB by facilitating the access of U.S. scientists to the international network of Biosphere Reserves to conduct studies on such topics as the roles of local people in the management of protected areas and problems of tropical forestry. United States and UNESCO MABs have also collaborated in conference on the Siting of Hazardous Technological Facilities and European Biosphere Reserves and on workshops on the Application of Remote Sensing Technologies to Urban Planning and on Transborder Environmental Problems.

Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission

The United States, as a Member State of the 115 member Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), continues its active participation as a member of the IOC Executive Council. In 1986 our financial contribution of \$300,000 helped support a number of international program activities considered to be of priority interest to U.S. marine science. The U.S. Delegation to the 19th session of the Executive Council was led by Dr. Anthony Calio, Under Secretary for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and U.S. Representative to the IOC.

Strong leadership in IOC subsidiary bodies is also maintained by U.S. national coordinators for IOC programs through the Interagency Panel for International Programs and Intergovernmental Cooperation in Ocean Affairs (PIPICO). In 1986, U.S. Delegations participated in a number of meetings, workshops, and symposia sponsored by the IOC to address the planning and coordination of global and regional scientific programs of importance to American scientists. These include the World Ocean Circulation Experiment (WOCE), Tropical Oceans and Global Atmosphere (TOGA) Experiment, International Oceanographic Data Exchange (IODE), Global Investigation of Pollution in the Marine Environment (GIPME), International Recruitment Experiment (IREX), Integrated Global Ocean Services System (IGOSS), Global Sea-Level Observing System (GLOSS), Subcommittee for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE), Regional Committee for the Western Pacific (WESTPAC), and the IOC Consultative Group on Ocean Mapping.

U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

The membership of all Commissioners expired at the end of 1985. Given the United States withdrawal from UNESCO, the status of the Commission is under review.

World Intellectual Property Organization

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was established by a convention signed at Stockholm in 1967 which entered into force on April 26, 1970. The United States is a party to the Convention which has 116 Member States. WIPO is the principal worldwide organization responsible for promoting the protection of intellectual property which comprises two elements: copyrights (mainly literary and artistic works) and industrial property (mainly patents on inventions, trademarks, and industrial designs). WIPO is also responsible for the administration of some 15 intergovernmental "Unions," each founded on a multilateral treaty. The two principal treaties are the 1883 Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which has 97 parties, and the 1886 Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, which has 76 parties. The United States is a party to the former Convention but not the latter.

Membership in WIPO is open to any member state of the Paris or Berne Unions, or of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, or which is invited to become a member by the WIPO General Assembly.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Paris and Berne Conventions had provided for an international bureau to serve as Secretariat for each respective Union. These were united in 1893, eventually under the name of the United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property (BIRPI). Although BIRPI still has a legal existence for states that are members of one of the Unions but not of WIPO, in practice it has been supplanted by the International Bureau established by the Stockholm Convention to be the Secretariat of WIPO. WIPO became a specialized agency of the United Nations in 1974.

The International Bureau operates under the direction of WIPO member states through a General Assembly and a Conference which meets biennially. The principal administrative organ of the Paris and Berne Unions is the Assembly of each Union,

consisting of all the member states. The Paris and Berne Unions elect Executive Committees from among their member states, and joint membership of these two committees constitutes WIPO's Co-ordination Committee, which meets annually and is entrusted with the normal tasks of such a governing body, especially the implementation of the biennial program and budget of WIPO. As a member of the Paris Union Executive Committee, the United States continued as a member of the WIPO Co-ordination Committee through 1986. In that year the United States was also a member of the following governing bodies of other organs of WIPO: the General Assembly, the Budget Committee, the Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights, the Permanent Committee on Patent Information, and the Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation related to Industrial Property.

The 1986-87 biennial budget of WIPO was adopted by the governing bodies in September 85. The amount of the gross assessed budget (for the Program Unions) is 47,128,000 Swiss francs. The United States did not join in the consensus because the budget contained program growth and unacceptable cost increases. The United States is assessed approximately 3.9% of the total assessments.

One of two basic objectives of WIPO is to promote the protection of intellectual property on a worldwide basis. In support of this objective, WIPO encourages the conclusion of new international treaties and the harmonization of national laws; it gives legal-technical assistance to developing countries; it assembles and disseminates information on intellectual property; it maintains international registration services in the fields of trademarks, industrial designs, and appellations of origin; and it performs the administrative tasks for an international patent filing arrangement.

The second basic objective of WIPO is to ensure administrative cooperation among the Unions. Centralizing the administration of the various Unions in the International Bureau helps ensure economy both for the Member States and for the private sector concerned with intellectual property.

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

The Permanent Committee for Patent Information (PCPI), established in 1977, coordinated all technical activities which previously were being undertaken by separate bodies in regard to the revision of the International Patent Classification under the Strasbourg Agreement, the activities of the Paris Union Commit-

tee for International Cooperation in Information Retrieval Among Patent Offices (ICIREPAT), certain technical activities under the Patent Cooperation Treaty, and various other existing or planned technical activities related to patent information.

ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Activities of WIPO in the field of development cooperation with respect to developing countries continued in 1986 under the direction of two committees composed of developed and developing countries, the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights. The United States participated in both of these committees and supported most of the activities which were numerous and varied. During 1986 WIPO continued to provide traineeships to officials from developing countries in the fields of industrial property and copyright. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office participated by providing training to a number of developing country nationals in the industrial property field.

REVISION OF THE PARIS CONVENTION

The United States continued its active participation in the revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, the most important multilateral treaty in this field. The first session of the Diplomatic Conference was held in February-March 1980 in Geneva. The Conference became bogged down in attempting to resolve the question of the voting majority for adoption of a revised text of the Paris Convention. Following an almost month-long discussion, voting rules were adopted over the objection of the United States in the concluding days of the Conference.

The developing countries, supported by the Socialist countries, had announced they wanted a two-thirds majority for adoption of the revised text of the Paris Convention. The compromise finally adopted, with the United States the only dissenter, called for the final text to be adopted by consensus, that is, without objection; but, if no consensus were reached, a two-thirds majority would be sufficient, provided no more than 12 members voted against. The United States protested the adoption of this rule by less than a unanimous vote and formally reserved its legal right to challenge the validity of any substantive action under the Rules of Procedure, particularly the adoption of a revised text, by less than a consensus.

In the opening of the second session of the Diplomatic Conference, held in Nairobi in September–October 1981, the United States again noted its opposition to the adoption by less than a unanimous vote, of a voting rule providing for less than a unanimous vote to adopt a revised text which evolved.

Almost all of the second session was spent attempting to resolve the issues regarding sanctions for not working a patented invention in a given country. The Group of 77 wanted to have greater discretion in the nature of the sanctions developing countries could apply and they wanted developing countries to be able to apply the sanctions sooner. The industrialized countries preferred limiting the sanctions which were available and giving inventors more time to work their inventions before sanctions could be applied. In addition, some of these industrialized countries felt that any relaxation in the nature of sanctions or in time limits should be available to any country and not only developing countries. However, the majority felt that any relaxation in existing requirements should be available only to developing countries. At the conclusion of the 4-week session, a revised text on the sanction matter alone was informally agreed to with only the United States objecting. The U.S. objection was directed primarily against the confiscatory nature of two sanctions which a developing country could apply for situations involving the nonworking of a patented invention. Further discussion on this matter, as well as on other matters which were only summarily discussed in the second session, was deferred to the third session, which was held in fall 1982.

The third session was held for four weeks in October and one week in November 1982. By general agreement the contentious issue of sanctions for failure to work a patent was not on the agenda. The third session concentrated in its first four weeks on trademark issues having to do with the use of geographical names to identify products. In view of strong European positions on these issues, it was not possible to reach final agreements on them. During the last week of the third session, continued discussions on ways of resolving the problem of sanctions for nonworking of patents were held with the expectation that they would be continued in a fourth session of the Conference.

The fourth session of the Conference was held in February and March 1984. Following four weeks of discussions, the issue of sanctions for failure to work a patent was unresolved. Agreement was achieved by the industrialized countries on the issue of the use of geographical names to identify products, but this agreement was not accepted by the Conference. In view of the inability to resolve any of the major issues, the Plenary of the Conference

adopted a resolution asking the Assembly of the Paris Union to convene a fifth session as soon as it finds prospects for positive results. The Assembly was also asked to set up machinery for consultations designed to prepare for the next session. The Assembly decided that the machinery would consist of consultative meetings among 10 representatives of each of the three groups (Group B, Group of 77, and the Socialist states) and China. The first consultative meeting was held in June, 1985. The only substantive item discussed was the matter of exclusive compulsory licenses for non-working of a patent in a particular country. No conclusion was reached. A second consultative meeting took place in January 1987.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

A total of 40 countries had ratified or adhered to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) by the end of 1986.

Under the PCT, United States citizens and residents may file an international patent application with the United States Patent and Trademark Office in Washington. The effect of the international application is the same as if national applications had been concurrently filed with national Patent Offices (including the European Patent Office) of those countries party to the PCT which the applicant designates. The international application is then subjected to a search of a prior art by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and the applicant then decides, on the basis of the international search report, whether it is worthwhile to pursue applications in the various countries designated. National procedures in such countries are delayed until 20 months after the priority date, unless the applicant asks for an earlier start.

An international application may be a first application or it may be a subsequent application invoking the priority of an application previously filed with the national office of a country party to the Paris Convention or with the European Patent Office. Where protection is sought in any country party to both the PCT and the European Patent Convention, the applicant may generally seek protection under the national law of that country or under the European Patent Convention.

BRUSSELS SATELLITE CONVENTION

On March 7, 1985, the United States became a party to the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite (Brussels Satellite Convention).

This Convention provides for the obligation of each contracting state to take adequate and effective measures to prevent the unauthorized distribution on or from its territory of any program-carrying signal transmitted by a satellite. Although there were only 11 countries party to this Convention at the end of 1986, it is a most important convention with respect to piracy of satellite television signals. The United States is encouraging other countries to join the Brussels Convention.

PROTECTION OF THE OLYMPIC SYMBOL

In a 2-day Diplomatic Conference in September 1981, a Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol was agreed to and signed on behalf of 21 countries. The United States, in the final vote on the instrument, which required a two-thirds vote for approval, voted against adoption primarily because the treaty erodes the ability of the U.S. Olympic Committee to retain licensing revenues for use of the U.S. Olympic teams. This agreement, which had been adhered to by 32 countries by the end of 1986, entered into force on September 25, 1982.

World Health Organization

The World Health Organization (WHO) in 1986 continued work on implementation of the strategy to achieve "health for all by the year 2000," giving special emphasis to the burgeoning epidemic of acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS). WHO established a new special program on AIDS in 1986 and organized numerous meetings and press conferences around the world to rally attention to the disease. The World Health Assembly in May also gave special attention to the Expanded Program on Immunization, infant feeding, essential drugs, and other substantive health issues.

The United States continued its role as one of the most active WHO member states. The U.S. Delegation took leading positions on many issues at the annual World Health Assembly, and U.S. Government agencies continued to supply numerous technical consultants and advisors to WHO to enhance its work in a variety of substantive health areas. U.S. Government policies regarding payment to international organizations, including WHO, stimulated considerable debate among WHO member states in the course of the year. U.S. Delegates to the Assembly, on numerous occasions, stressed that the Assembly debates needed to remain within

WHO's established responsibility and not engage in debate over political issues outside WHO's technical area.

The U.S. Delegation to the 39th annual Assembly, held in Geneva on May 5-16, was headed by Dr. Otis R. Bowen, Secretary of Health and Human Services. The delegation also included Dr. C. Everett Koop, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service; Dr. Frank E. Young, Commissioner of Food and Drugs; Dr. Kenneth Bart, Agency Director for Health, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Neil A. Boyer, Director for Health and Transportation Programs in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs of the Department of State.

Secretary Bowen, in an address to the Assembly, reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to WHO, particularly its work in fighting AIDS and in reducing the incidence of smoking. Dr. Bowen told the delegates from WHO's 166 member countries that AIDS was one of the most acute problems facing the United States and the world. He noted, in addition, that smoking in the United States among males aged 20 and older, had been reduced by 17 percentage points from 1965 to 1983—from 52.1 percent to 35.4 percent. "Because deaths associated with smoking are preventable," he said, "I applaud this organization for helping to spread the word on smoking hazards worldwide."

In January 1986, the United States sent an observer delegation to the annual three-week meeting of the 31-member WHO Executive Board. The United States traditionally is elected to name a member of the Board to serve three years out of each four. In the one year that the United States does not have a member on the Board, an observer delegation attends the meeting. In the course of the Assembly in May, the United States was elected to name a member for a new three-year term on the Board. President Reagan named Dr. Young as the U.S. member. In October, Dr. Young participated in the meeting of the Board's 9-member Program Committee, in discussions of WHO's next six-year plan and of methods to improve the operations of the annual World Health Assembly.

At the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), which also serves as WHO regional office for the Americas, the United States sent a delegation to the September meeting of the 22nd quadrennial Pan American Sanitary Conference, an observer delegation to the June meeting of the PAHO Executive Committee, and a delegation by invitation of the Director to the April meeting of the Committee's Subcommittee on Planning and Programming. The United States also sent a delegation to the September 1986 meeting of the WHO regional committee for the Western Pa-

cific, held in Manila, the Philippines, and an observer delegation to the September meeting of the WHO regional committee for Europe, held in Copenhagen. Dr. Peter Fischinger, Deputy Director of the National Cancer Institute, headed the U.S. Delegation to the annual meeting of the Governing Council of WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), held in Lyon, France.

HEALTH ISSUES

The World Health Assembly gave extensive treatment to a number of pressing health issues, including immunizations, AIDS, smoking, infant feeding, and the use of pharmaceuticals.

AIDS

The Assembly gave serious attention to the growing epidemic of acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), and noted with satisfaction the action taken by WHO in encouraging member states to report on the incidence of AIDS. More than 20 delegations addressed the issue in public session. The U.S. Delegation noted the interest of the Agency for International Development (AID) in offering financial support to the WHO work. Later in the year, AID provided \$2 million to help initiate the new WHO AIDS-control program. Beginning in June, Dr. Jonathan Mann, an American citizen on loan to WHO from the Centers for Disease Control of the U.S. Public Health Service, was appointed director of WHO's AIDS-control activity.

In November Director General Mahler and Dr. Mann held a press conference at the United Nations in New York to explain the new WHO initiative. Dr. Mahler said that to mount an effective AIDS program, WHO would need approximately \$200 million a year in new resources immediately, and anticipated a need of approximately \$1.5 billion a year by 1990. Mahler told the press conference that he could "not imagine a worse health problem in this century. We're running scared. We stand nakedly in front of a very serious pandemic as mortal as any pandemic there ever has been. I don't know of any greater killer than AIDS, not to speak of its psychological, social, and economic maiming." In December, Dr. Mann spent a week in Washington talking with Administration officials, key Congressional staff members, and interested nongovernmental organizations about the AIDS program.

Immunizations

The WHO Expanded Program on Immunization also received strong endorsement from the Assembly. In a resolution, the WHO staff was asked to increase its collaboration with member states in order to meet the goal of making immunizations against six major childhood diseases available to all children of the world by 1990.

Guineaworm

A proposal formulated by the U.S. Delegation addressed the the possibilities of eradicating guineaworm, or dracunculiasis, a virulent disease found primarily in Africa. Dr. Donald Hopkins, Deputy Director of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, noted that eradication of this disease should be one of the side benefits from work on improving drinking water and sanitation facilities under the programs of the UN Water Decade and would serve as a marker of progress in the Decade. The U.S. resolution was adopted by consensus. Another consensus resolution called for more determined efforts by Member States to implement the goals of the water decade during its second half.

Smoking

The Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that tobacco smoking and its use in all forms is incompatible with the WHO goal of "health for all by the year 2000." The resolution called for a global public health approach to combatting the tobacco "pandemic," and "deplores all direct and indirect practices the aim of which is to promote the use of tobacco, as this product is addictive and dangerous even when used as promoted." Surgeon General Koop made a strong statement for the United States urging increased attention to the dangers of tobacco. "Now is the time for WHO to put its credibility and prestige behind a very aggressive campaign for smoking control," he told the Assembly. "Otherwise our goal for health for all by the year 2000 is hypocritical."

Pharmaceuticals

The Assembly unanimously endorsed the "revised drug strategy" developed by WHO following its November 1985 expert meeting in Nairobi on the "rational use of drugs" (see *U.S. in the UN, 1985*, pages 227-28). At the request of the U.S. Delegation, WHO staff publicly clarified the intentions of the drug strategy, in par-

ticular stressing that WHO was not and did not intend to become a supranational regulatory agency. During the remainder of the year, WHO staff took initial steps to implement segments of the new strategy, including the naming of members of several working groups which would later convene to review papers prepared by the staff. U.S. Government officials made clear to WHO staff and delegates of other nations the U.S. view that it would be inappropriate for WHO's involvement in the pharmaceutical area to extend to efforts to regulate the marketing of pharmaceutical products. WHO staff in return assured Assembly delegates that WHO had no intention of becoming a supranational regulatory agency.

A resolution calling for attention to the use of alcohol in the formulation of certain drugs, drafted by several Arab state delegations, was referred by the Assembly to the Executive Board for further study.

Infant Feeding

Every two years, at the request of earlier Assemblies, the World Health Assembly receives a report on the status of infant feeding practices. During discussion of the 1986 report, Surgeon General Koop expressed concern about the accuracy of comments by a WHO expert group about proper and improper occasions for use of breastmilk substitutes.

Nordic countries and the delegations of several developing nations then put forward a resolution which attempted to prescribe new rules for infant formula marketing practices and asserted a WHO interest in the marketing of infant feeding products other than infant formula. The United States was the only country to oppose this resolution. In a statement to the Assembly, U.S. Delegate Neil A. Boyer expressed regret that the draft resolution tried to increase the number of commercial products in which WHO had regulatory interest. Also, he said, the resolution's request that maternity wards and hospitals not use free or subsidized supplies of breastmilk substitutes "seems to be an unnecessary folly. It appears to impose a new and expensive burden on the hospitals of developing countries, which can ill afford the supplies they need," he said. "Medicines, vaccines, and surgical supplies are often provided free, or are subsidized. Why should the global WHO be trying to dictate how the maternity hospital in your local community carries out its business?" Noting that the United States had opposed the breastmilk substitutes code of 1981, Boyer said the U.S. delegation had no option than to oppose an Assembly resolution that sought to extend WHO's regulatory interests.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 92 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed, and 6 abstaining.

Health for All

The Assembly also considered other reports relating to progress towards its goal of "health for all by the year 2000." It adopted by consensus a resolution approving a report on evaluation of the global strategy and urging Member States to make use of their national evaluation reports in order to guide the development of future health policies. Another resolution called for intersectoral cooperation in the implementation of national "health for all" strategies, in particular for the development of national health objectives "as an integral part of sectoral policies for agriculture, the environment, education, water, housing, and other health-related sectors."

Another resolution focused on the repercussions on health of the "worldwide economic crisis" and appealed to industrialized countries to increase their cooperation with developing nations. The U.S. Delegation objected to what it said were extraneous political elements in the resolution, one pertaining to the "New International Economic Order" and another to the policies of international banks, which the United States said are not the proper concern of the World Health Assembly. For these reasons, the United States called for a vote on the resolution, and it was adopted by a vote of 78 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed, and 15 abstaining, most of them Western European countries.

Chernobyl Follow Up

The damage to the nuclear reactor at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union in April 1986, immediately preceding the World Health Assembly, led to expressions of serious concern about the health ramifications of such an accident. WHO's regional office for Europe, in Copenhagen, immediately convened a meeting of interested parties to share facts known about the event. At the Assembly, Director General Mahler explained the steps WHO had taken and promised intensified action. The United States and other delegations praised WHO's prompt involvement and stressed the need for full and timely information about nuclear accidents in the future. Over the remainder of the year, WHO collaborated with other interested UN-system agencies, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in providing followup action to the Chernobyl accident.

Other Health Matters

The Assembly also discussed and adopted resolutions on mental, neurological, and psychosocial disorders, the abuse of narcotic and psychotropic substances, and iodine deficiency disorders. Numerous additional topics were raised during the general debate statements by the health ministers of countries attending the Assembly.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ISSUES

U.S. Government financial obligations to the UN system, and particularly to WHO, were key issues of concern to the WHO staff and to delegations of other countries in the course of 1986. The United States had been assessed \$61,145,990 in 1985. Of that amount, \$55,317,990 was paid on November 28, 1985, and another \$3,199,000 was paid in February 1986. WHO was told that the unpaid balance of \$2,629,000 reflected the basic 4.3 percent reduction applied to the Department of State as a whole under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit-reduction legislation. In January 1986, the WHO Executive Board gave extended attention to the problem of member governments who cannot or do not pay their assessments on time, and the possibilities of imposing penalties for late payment. The Board recommended that the Assembly adopt a resolution addressing "members that systematically make a practice of late payment of contributions."

The U.S. assessment for 1986 amounted to \$62,797,675. In accordance with the Kassebaum-Solomon legislation (which required reduction of U.S. payments to WHO from 25 to 20 percent of the total assessment in the absence of reform of budget adoption procedures), and with other limitations, the United States requested from the Congress \$46,072,000 for its calendar 1986 payment. In anticipation that the U.S. legislation would exacerbate the WHO financial situation, the WHO secretariat in April 1986 imposed a freeze on the implementation of \$35 million in program activity. Following the appropriation of funds for UN-system agencies, the United States paid WHO \$10 million in December 1986 and informed the agency that, because of a freeze imposed by the Congress on the expenditure of \$130 million in funds obligated for U.S. contributions to international organizations, a further payment would be delayed until October 1, 1987. The United States said WHO could expect another payment of about \$35 million on its 1986 assessments at that time. It explained that allocations of the limited available resources needed to take into account the fact that several UN agencies were experiencing very serious cash-flow situations and needed to be given favored treat-

ment. The United States believed that WHO's international financial resources would enable it to endure a delay in the payment of U.S. assessments, and accordingly only a small amount was provided during 1986. At the end of 1986, the U.S. arrearage amounted to \$55,426,675.

At the World Health Assembly in May, several delegations asked about the impact on health programs that might result from the reported shortfall in the collection of assessments. Assistant Director General Warren Furth (U.S.) told the Assembly he saw little hope for an end to the crisis. He anticipated that the shortfall in assessments might be greater than the \$35 million in program activity already put on hold, and said that the Director General planned a freeze on \$50 million in program activity in the 1988-89 biennium. The U.S. Delegation pointed out that the financial difficulties were broad and not attributable to just one country. At the end of the 1984-85 biennium, the U.S. delegation noted, the financial report showed that 76 countries still owed part of their assessment for the biennium and that 19 countries had made no payment whatsoever during that period. Arrearages totaled \$28,032,817, of which the United States share was \$5,828,000.

In September, at a press conference in Washington, Director General Mahler said that the U.S. decision to withhold the major share of its 1986 assessment "will be difficult to sustain because we have no fat in the WHO budget." He said "I hope the United States and its legislative bodies will feel that this is not a particularly wise thing to do to an organization like WHO." He said he had written a long letter to Secretary of State Shultz "in essence saying that we don't deserve this kind of treatment."

In the introduction to the proposed 1988-89 program budget, issued in December, Dr. Mahler described his proposal as a "phantom program budget." "I am duty bound," he said, "to present program budget proposals as though all Member States will pay their contribution in full. Yet it is clear, from the experience of 1986-87, that this is most unlikely to be the case. The most bitter blow of all is that apparently it is precisely WHO's display of fiscal responsibility in the past that has led to its budget being struck most severely, on the false assumption that it is able to absorb further fiscal shocks." The proposed budget was to be reviewed in detail by the Executive Board in January 1987 and the World Health Assembly in May 1987.

On related administrative matters, the Assembly in May 1986 approved an expansion of the casual income facility from \$20 million to \$31 million. The facility was designed to help protect

WHO's approved programs against losses due to currency fluctuations. The original \$20 million facility was intended to protect against losses related to the Swiss franc; the \$11 million additional protection was related to other currencies in which WHO has major expenditures. In preparation of the 1988-89 budget proposal at the end of the year, WHO noted that there had been a sharp drop in the U.S. dollar against the Swiss franc. The 1986-87 program budget had been adopted at a rate of 2.50 Swiss francs to the dollar, but at the time of assembling the draft proposal for 1988-89, the rate was 1.65 Swiss francs to the dollar. Even if program activity was maintained at the same level, the staff said, there would be a significant increase in cost of the new biennial program because of the revised exchange rates.

The World Health Assembly in May also agreed to adopt a revised scale of assessments for the second year of the 1986-87 biennium. The revised scale was modeled on a new scale approved by the UN General Assembly in December 1985. Under the new WHO scale, the U.S. assessment rate stands at 25 percent. However, due to fluctuations in the assessments of other countries and changes in the tax equalization credits, the U.S. assessment for 1987 was to be slightly lower than that for 1986, falling from \$62,797,675 to \$62,778,850.

POLITICAL ISSUES

In January the Executive Board took up a discussion paper prepared by the WHO secretariat, at the Board's request, on the subject of politicization of the annual World Health Assembly. The Board had been concerned about excessive political debate at the 1985 Assembly, and some members were hoping that the Board in January 1986 could adopt new procedures that could screen out irrelevant political issues. However, there was no consensus in the Board's discussion. Members from Cuba and the eastern bloc argued that there could be no infringement on the free speech of delegates to the Assembly, that they could not be prevented from raising issues that they felt were of importance to improved health, even if other members thought these subjects were "political." The Board agreed that this subject should be deleted from the agenda of the May Assembly, since the sharp divisions on the Board were likely to be replicated in a divisive debate by the full WHO membership.

Following the 1986 Assembly, the majority of Board members once again were critical of divisive Assembly debate. Members from Cuba, the Soviet Union, and Mongolia once again were quick to register opposition to those who would block what they called

the legitimate discussion of the negative effects on health of various political situations, such as the occupation of Palestine or the threat of nuclear war. Director General Mahler told the Board that members needed to understand that no one who was serious about progress in health could leave a discussion of health issues without a consensus, and he urged all WHO members to work for consensus on all questions coming before it. The Board asked its Program Committee to look into improvement of the methods of work of the Assembly at its meeting in October, but it was understood that, given the divisions on this question, there was no possibility of achieving consensus on the creation of new mechanisms for the elimination of political issues.

In the course of the May Assembly, several political issues had arisen, and these had given rise to the concerns of the Board:

Action Regarding Israel

The Assembly took up the long-standing issue of "Health Conditions of the Arab Population in the Occupied Arab Territories, including Palestine." The Government of Israel had decided to deny access to the occupied territories for the Special Committee of Experts, who had been asked by the 1985 Assembly to carry on their study. Israel argued that the resolution adopted by the 1985 Assembly had been illegal and unconstitutional, and accordingly it had no obligation to agree to its terms and permit a visit to the territories. The Committee did visit Damascus and Amman, immediately prior to the Assembly, but it concluded that "the refusal to allow the visit (to the occupied territories) to take place is not considered by the Committee as a positive contribution towards solving the difficulties prevailing in the region." There was considerable criticism of the Israeli position by Arab state Delegations to the Assembly.

There was no effort to reject the credentials of the Israeli Delegation or to deny Israel program services. However, the Assembly adopted its customary resolution condemning Israeli practices, and calling for the Special Committee of Experts to make another visit and to report to the 1987 Assembly. Israel first moved to have the Assembly declare the draft resolution "not receivable." The motion failed by a vote of 5 in favor (U.S.), 52 opposed, and 34 abstaining. A 4-hour committee debate then ended with a vote of 61 in favor of the resolution drafted by the Arab states, 22 opposed (U.S.), and 18 abstaining. In the plenary, the vote was 64 in favor, 21 opposed (U.S.), and 27 abstaining.

The U.S. Delegate, Neil Boyer, expressed regret that there was no effort to develop a legitimate and non-contentious way of

having the Assembly examine health conditions in the occupied territories. "It must be possible," he said, "to draft a resolution that would focus on health matters, and avoid political matters, and to do so in a manner that is constructive for world health. But from year to year, we see little or no effort to take this step by the cosponsors of the resolution." The delegation of Israel once again told the Assembly that the approved resolution was unconstitutional, null and void, and that Israel would not receive, in 1987, a study committee that related to a mandate from that resolution.

International Year of Peace

Although there was no relevant item on the Assembly agenda, the U.S.S.R. and others introduced a resolution endorsing the UN International Year of Peace and calling for a cessation of the arms race. Some modifications were made to tone down the text, but the resolution was not acceptable to many delegations, and there ensued a four-hour procedural wrangle. This is the issue that largely led the Executive Board to debate the question of Assembly politicization.

The U.S. Delegation said at the outset of the debate that the draft resolution was irrelevant to WHO activity and proposed that no decision be taken on it. Cuba challenged the chairman's decision to put the U.S. proposal to a vote, and the challenge was upheld by a vote of 31 in favor, 25 (U.S.) opposed, and 38 abstaining. The United Kingdom then moved that the resolution was not receivable by the Assembly. Extended debate on whether to vote on the U.K. motion, including several *ad hominem* comments by the Cuban delegate against the WHO legal advisor, ended when Canada called for closure of debate, which would have brought the resolution to a vote. The United States then moved adjournment of the debate, which would have ended the discussion without a vote and had precedence over the Canadian proposal.

At the end of the debate, the Committee rejected the U.S. motion to adjourn debate by a vote of 18 in favor (U.S.), 40 opposed, and 30 abstaining. It accepted the Canadian proposal to close debate by a vote of 92 in favor (U.S.), none opposed, and 5 abstaining. And it adopted the Soviet resolution by a vote of 54 in favor, 5 opposed (U.S.), and 42 abstaining. The U.S. Delegate then took the floor to point out that the committee session had been turned into a 4-hour circus by introduction of an irrelevant political issue, and thanked the delegates of Cuba and the Soviet Union for helping to make that point. Both the Cuban and Soviet Delegates exercised rights of reply. The United Kingdom called for an-

other vote in the plenary, and the resolution was endorsed by a vote of 63 in favor, 7 opposed (U.S.), and 39 abstaining.

African Issues

The United States again expressed regret that no consensus could be reached on the Assembly's traditional resolution concerning health conditions in southern Africa. Despite a few improvements in the text over that adopted in prior years, the resolution still contained objectionable political judgments and had been worsened, in the U.S. view, by the insertion of requests for assistance to national liberation movements, which the United States has always opposed. The vote was 97 in favor of the resolution, 1 opposed (U.S.), and 3 abstaining.

Morocco Regional Assignment

The Assembly approved without discussion the move of Morocco from the European to the Eastern Mediterranean regional group.

Chemical War

Iran once again introduced a draft resolution criticizing the use of chemical weapons. In contrast to Iranian drafts of prior years, the resolution was more mildly worded and more closely related to health concerns. On the same day that it was distributed, the delegate of Jordan contended that the text was not receivable and asked for a vote to dismiss it. Iran asked for invocation of the rule requiring 2 day's time between the circulation of a draft resolution and its consideration by the committee so that members could read the new text. Djibouti called for a roll-call vote on the Iran motion to adjourn the debate, and the Committee agreed to defer action, by a vote of 39 in favor (U.S.), 14 opposed, and 40 abstaining.

Two days later, the committee went to an immediate vote, without discussion, of the Jordanian motion that the resolution was "not receivable." By a vote of 23 in favor, 17 opposed, and 55 (U.S.) abstaining, the committee agreed for the third year in a row to reject the Iranian proposal. Following the voting, the delegations of Israel, Iraq, and Iran engaged in extended vitriolic debate, ending only when Director General Mahler pleaded with the delegates not to undo all the effective work of the Assembly in the recent past to build consensus into health decisions.

PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The 22d quadrennial Pan American Sanitary Conference was held at PAHO headquarters in Washington on September 22-27. Secretary Bowen headed the U.S. Delegation and hosted a reception for delegates in the Benjamin Franklin Room of the Department of State. In contrast to many previous sessions of PAHO governing bodies, the meeting was marked with numerous indications of friendly attitudes of governments of the region toward the United States. U.S. Delegates were elected to the Executive Committee and three other posts, and there were numerous speeches in praise of U.S. assistance to member governments.

The major actions of the conference were to reelect the PAHO Director, Dr. Carlyle Guerra de Macedo, of Brazil, to a second 4-year term, and to approve a broad policy document to guide PAHO activity for 4 years until the next Conference. There was no opposition to Dr. Macedo's candidacy. Surgeon General Koop spoke in support of Dr. Macedo. The secret ballot vote was 34 for Dr. Macedo, 1 ballot blank, and 3 absent. Portugal, which pledged extensive cooperation with PAHO, joined Spain in being approved as an out-of-region observer state. PAHO rules on this procedure were tightened so that, in essence, no other state will qualify for this status.

The conference approved the tentative allocation provided to the region by the World Health Organization for 1988-89. The allocation provided an 8.8 percent increase to cover inflation and no program increase. WHO had been willing to allow PAHO an increase of 13.5 percent for cost increases. The U.S. Delegation praised PAHO for the frugality of its estimates and the honesty of its approach to WHO. Dr. Macedo described the financial problems facing WHO, including recent U.S. legislative initiatives. He felt that PAHO needed to make plans immediately to accommodate a shortfall, and the U.S. Delegation supported that opinion. The United States withheld \$562,000 of its 1986 assessment of \$34,849,762 as a result of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation.

Although the meeting was basically nonpolitical, the U.S. Delegation had to object to the distribution at the meeting of a seven-page document by the Health Minister of Nicaragua containing numerous charges against the United States relating to the U.S. embargo on trade with Nicaragua. Aside from the U.S. complaint, there was no discussion of the issue.

The Cuban Delegation voiced objection to the U.S. denial of a visa to a Cuban official invited to participate in a PAHO expert committee meeting. The Cuban speaker said it was dangerous to

the stability of PAHO if the host country could impede access of a member state with full rights of participation in PAHO, and that the United States was deliberately creating a climate of discord within the organization. Dr. Macedo explained the U.S. policy regarding the issuance of visas for Cuban officials, as explained to him by the Department of State. The U.S. Delegate said U.S. policy permitted issuance of visas to Cuban expert participants in PAHO affairs. He noted that cases could still arise in which visas were denied, but the United States hoped that such instances would be rare.

INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER

The 27th meeting of the Governing Council of IARC was held at its headquarters in Lyon, France, on April 29–30. The meeting was the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the founding of IARC, marked by several ceremonies, including a dinner given by the French Minister of Health.

The chief topic of discussion was the United States withholding of 4.3 percent of its 1985 assessment to IARC under the Gramm–Rudman–Hollings legislation. Although the U.S. withholding amounted in total to only \$27,000, other Council members complained that the United States felt it necessary to impose this decision even after Council decisions had reduced the U.S. assessment by 25 percent from 1985 to 1986 (this was largely because of the increase in membership and the strengthening of the dollar against the French franc during that period). The Council considered a resolution that would demand that all members pay their full assessments. The U.S. Delegation said that, before taking such a course, the Council should carefully consider the implications of that tactic, and the Council then rejected it as premature. WHO Director General Mahler told the Council it should give the United States the benefit of the doubt and interpret the situation as one in which “the United States is unable to pay its full share at this particular time” and to assume that the United States had not made a flat refusal to pay its assessment.

Dr. Lorenzo Tomatis of Italy was reelected director of the agency, for a new 5-year term. He was the only candidate from one of the member states of IARC. In the secret ballot, he received 12 of the 13 votes cast.

Finland was accepted by the Council as the 13th Member State. In debate over the proper use of the new contribution from Finland, some members wanted the contribution to be used to help lower the burden of payments by other countries. The Finnish Delegate, in response, made clear that it was joining the

agency for the primary purpose of advancing cancer research and not to permit other Member States to have lower assessments. It said that if a new member joining the organization could not have the benefit of enhancing the agency's research capability, then there was no incentive for other countries to join. The Council agreed to take the equivalent of the first year's contribution from Finland and use it for new program activity.

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

IMO membership consists of 130 full members and one associate member. Since its inception in 1958, the IMO has had its headquarters in London. The main objective of the IMO is to foster cooperation among governments on technical matters affecting international shipping to achieve the highest practicable standard of maritime safety at sea and to protect the marine environment through prevention of pollution of the sea caused by ships and other craft. The IMO also deals with legal matters concerning international shipping and with the facilitation of international maritime traffic. The IMO provides technical assistance in maritime matters to developing countries and maintains a close relationship with the World Maritime University, which is in Malmo, Sweden.

The IMO consists of the following organs: Assembly; Council (with an elected membership of 32); Maritime Safety Committee (MSC); Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC); Legal, Facilitation, and Technical Cooperation Committees; and various technical subcommittees. The Council reviews the work of the committees and refers the work to the Assembly for final approval. Plenipotentiary Conferences elaborate and adopt major conventions.

ASSEMBLY

The Assembly consists of the full membership, which meets in regular session every 2 years. The 14th Session was held in November 1985.

COUNCIL

The Council is responsible for all the functions of the Assembly between sessions. The Council reviews the reports of the various committees before sending them to the Assembly and develops a recommended program budget for Assembly approval. The 57th Session of the Council, which met November 10-14, 1986, de-

cided that the IMO should develop a Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, and set a goal of the end of 1987 for the completion of all work on the convention except adoption by a diplomatic conference, which would be held in early 1988.

MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE (MSC)

The M.S.C is the IMO's senior technical committee charged with resolving technical and policy issues covering a broad range of topics. Ten technical subcommittees report to the Committee. The work program of these subcommittees is specifically developed and approved by the MSC. The 52d and 53d sessions of the MSC were held January 27–February 5 and September 8–17, 1986, respectively. These sessions achieved advances in a variety of measures that will improve maritime safety on an international basis.

One of the MSC's major accomplishments in 1986 was the development of specific measures for the prevention of unlawful acts against passengers and crews on board ships. This international action was precipitated by the hijacking of the cruise ship "Achille Lauro" in October 1985 and was initiated by the United States.

LEGAL COMMITTEE

The Legal Committee met April 7–11 (56th Session) and October 27–31, 1986 (57th Session). The Committee concentrated on the draft revision of the 1910 Convention on Salvage and Assistance at Sea. This revision imposes duties on salvors and shipowners to protect the environment, and creates an exception to the "no-cure, no-pay" doctrine by guaranteeing salvors' reasonable expenses for assistance rendered to vessels threatening damage to the environment. In addition to nearly completing its work on the draft salvage convention, the Committee considered resolutions relating to: (a) international cooperation in maritime casualty investigations; (b) unlawful detention of seafarers abroad; and (c) the proposed establishment of an IMO/UNCTAD joint group of intergovernmental experts to study the subject of maritime liens and mortgages.

MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMITTEE (MEPC)

At its 23rd Session, held in July 1986, the MEPC approved all but one of the U.S. proposals to strengthen the provisions for im-

plementation of Annex III of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 Relating Thereto (MARPOL 73/78). Annex III regulates pollution by harmful substances carried by sea in packaged form. It is anticipated that these measures will further increase the likelihood of ratification of Annex III by states and ultimately the entry into force of the Annex once the gross tonnage requirement under Article 15 of the Convention has been met. In addition to reiterating its position that ships must be in full compliance with Annex II of MARPOL 73/78 (Regulations for the Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk) on the effective date, the MEPC also adopted Annex II control procedures and survey guidelines and approved the Annex II categorizations for liquid substances including requirements for their carriage under the IMO Code for Construction and Equipment of Ships Carrying Noxious Substances in Bulk (Bulk Chemical Code).

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

The Cook Islands became a party to the Convention on International Civil Aviation in 1986. Consequently, the membership of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) increased to 157 Contracting States. In November Dr. Assad Kotaite, an international civil servant, was unanimously elected President of the ICAO Council for a fifth 3-year term. Mr. Edmund Stohr, the U.S. Representative on the ICAO Council, was elected First Vice President of the Council.

ICAO COUNCIL

Security of international civil aviation continued to be given a high priority by ICAO in 1986. The Council's comprehensive amendment of ICAO Annex 17, International Standards and Recommended Practices for Safeguarding International Civil Aviation Against Acts of Unlawful Interference, became applicable to all ICAO Member States on May 19. As a result of this amendment, 11 new specifications were introduced into the Annex and 19 specifications already in the Annex were upgraded to Standards. The speed with which this amendment of an ICAO Annex became applicable to help combat terrorism set an ICAO record. The United States played a prominent role in the adoption of that amendment.

On June 25 the Council, under its Plan of Action on aviation security, adopted a model clause on aviation security for use by States in their bilateral air transport agreements. This clause states that the contracting parties:

(a) reaffirm their obligation to each other to protect the security of civil aviation and particularly to act in conformity with the 1963 Tokyo Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, the 1970 Hague Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, and the 1971 Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation;

(b) shall provide upon request all necessary assistance to each other to prevent acts of unlawful seizure of civil aircraft and other unlawful acts against the safety of such aircraft, their passengers and crew, airports, and air navigation facilities, and any other threat to the security of civil aviation;

(c) in their mutual relations, shall act in conformity, and require operators of their registry to act in conformity, with the security provisions in the ICAO Annexes to the extent applicable to them;

(d) agree that such operators may be required to observe these ICAO provisions for entry into, departure from, or while within the territory of the other party; also each party shall ensure that adequate measures effectively apply within its territory to protect the aircraft and inspect passengers, crew, carry-on items, baggage, cargo and aircraft stores, and shall give sympathetic consideration to any request from the other party for reasonable special security measures to meet a particular threat;

(e) shall assist each other by appropriate measures to terminate rapidly and safely an incident or threat of unlawful interference.

On short notice, the Council convened the Second *Ad Hoc* Meeting of Aviation Security Experts at ICAO headquarters in Montreal from July 14 to 18. While there was general agreement that it was too soon again to amend Annex 17, there was a consensus that the ICAO security manual, which supplements the Annex, should be rewritten as quickly as possible. The representatives in the meeting from all parts of the world, including the United States, showed an exceptional knowledge of aviation security and a desire to continue to increase ICAO's role in this most important international civil aviation area. Most of these same representatives will serve on the new Aviation Security Panel, which has been established by the Council to replace the *ad hoc* committee.

On December 18 the Council adopted the following declarations as the result of the sentencing by a British court of the Syrian who attempted to destroy an El Al airliner in flight to Tel Aviv from New York by placing a plastic bomb in his unwitting girl friend's carry-on bag during an intermediate stop at London/Heathrow Airport:

The Council notes with abhorrence what appears to be the emergence of a growing trend in acts of unlawful interference aimed at the total destruction in flight of civil aircraft in commercial service and the death of all on board.

The Council recalls its previous condemnation of all acts of unlawful interference with international civil aviation and re-affirms its determination to treat Aviation Security as an issue of top priority.

The Council calls upon all Contracting States, acting individually and in cooperation with one another, to take all possible steps to suppress acts of unlawful interference and to punish the perpetrators of any such acts.

At the request of Syria, the Council adopted a resolution on February 28 by a vote of 21 to 1 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions, condemning the action of Israel on February 4 in intercepting and diverting in international airspace a Libyan Arab Airlines aircraft. The United States voted against the resolution because the resolution contained condemnatory language that did not take into account the context of terrorist attacks against Israel. In March the Council adopted a series of amendments to the ICAO Annexes and Procedures for Air Navigation Services to clarify and strengthen ICAO provisions relating to interception of civil aircraft by military aircraft. (The United States has emphasized that these provisions are advisory only as regards state aircraft.) These changes were the result of a detailed review by the ICAO Air Navigation Commission pursuant to Council resolutions adopted in September 1985 following the Soviet destruction of Korean Air Line flight 007.

Among the more important amendments to ICAO Annexes adopted by the Council in 1986 was an Amendment of Annex 6, Operation of Aircraft. This amendment included new provisions concerning extended-range operations by large aircraft with twin turbo-powered engines. (During the previous year, three airlines were known to have operated this kind of aircraft on scheduled services across the North Atlantic.) The new ICAO Standards require the State of the operator to establish a threshold time to an enroute alternate (at single-engine cruise speed) beyond which a twin-engine turbine-powered airplane should not be allowed to operate unless certain special requirements are fulfilled. The Standards also indicate the factors which must be taken into account in approving flights beyond the threshold, including:

- specific airworthiness certification to ensure system reliability,
- power-unit reliability, and
- maintenance and operating practices, including dispatch procedures and crew training.

The Standards also make specific reference to the need to ensure before a flight is allowed to depart that the required en-route alternates will be open and that the forecast weather at those alternates will be above limits for the time period when they could be required.

ICAO ASSEMBLY

One hundred forty-two Contracting States, the largest number in the history of ICAO, attended the Twenty-Sixth Session of the Assembly, held at the headquarters of the Organization from September 23 to October 10.

The U.S. Delegation, chaired by Admiral Donald D. Engen, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, and subsequently by Edmund Stohr, was successful in its bid for reelection to the ICAO Council in Part 1 of the election, States of chief importance in air transport. Also with the strong support of the United States, the Assembly assigned top priority for the next three years to ICAO's work on aviation security. The Canadian resolution calling for ICAO to draw up a new international legal instrument for the suppression of unlawful acts of violence at international airports was cosponsored by over 35 states, including the United States, and adopted by consensus.

The U.S.-proposed resolutions for further work by ICAO against drug trafficking by air and for facilitation of air transportation of disabled or elderly persons were adopted with wide acclaim for their humanitarian aspects. The United States abstained on the compromise resolution (a) dealing with exemptions from restrictions on the operation of subsonic aircraft of foreign registry which do not meet the noise standards of Chapter 2 of ICAO Annex 16 by January 1, 1988, and (b) requesting an ICAO study of the economic implications of restrictions at a later date based on Chapter 3 standards for recommendations to be made to the 1989 ICAO Assembly. U.S. noise regulations already call for Chapter 2 standards at all U.S. airports, and exemptions are no longer being granted. Furthermore, it is not known what action the United States will decide to take with regard to Chapter 3 noise standards.

The Technical Commission recommended a resolution concerning flight safety and human factors and a revised consolidated statement of continuing air navigation policies and procedures, both of which the United States supported.

In addition to the resolution against air transport activities by other international bodies interested in trade in services, approved by consensus after amendment, the Economic Commission recommended two resolutions. One concerned the imposition of national and local taxes on airlines and the other concerned priorities for ICAO's work program in the air transport field. The latter resolution, which the United States supported, directs the Council to follow the same procedures in establishing priorities in the air transport area as it does in the air navigation area. The U.S. Delegation also called for the establishment of overall priorities to guide the work of the Council and Secretariat. Tariff enforcement was effectively removed from the ICAO work program. The Delegation succeeded in blocking a draft resolution to accord "highest priority" to unilateral measures by States such as competition laws.

The United States joined a consensus on an ICAO budget, proposed in the Administrative Commission for the 1987-1989 triennium, of U.S. \$96,622,000 representing negative real growth. All the foregoing recommendations of the Commissions were adopted by the Assembly. The U.S. Delegation voted against two politically inspired resolutions. The one against South Africa, urging Contracting States to ban air links and suspend or terminate bilateral air transport agreements with that country, was adopted by a roll-call vote of 83 to 12 (U.S.) with 19 abstentions. The resolution against Israel, based on a working paper presented by Libya and 13 other Arab States, enumerating Israeli actions against civil aviation and directing the ICAO Council to take further measures against Israel to protect international civil aviation as called for in a previous Assembly resolution, was adopted by a show of hands 68 to 2 (U.S. and Israel), with 38 abstentions.

Third Meeting of the Future Air Navigation Systems (FANS) Committee

In November U.S. leadership in FANS/3 resulted in agreement on a satellite communications system architecture and structure which will enable multiple satellite service providers to offer air-ground communication service around the globe with interoperability for the user community. The Committee was able to agree on a concept and message structure for the achievement of Automatic Dependent Surveillance using satellites, a system

which can be used, first in oceanic airspace, to provide improved communications and automatic reporting of aircraft position derived from the aircraft navigation system. The Committee also worked on an overall communications, navigation, and surveillance (CNS) system concept for the future in harmony with U.S. views.

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL—41ST SESSION

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) held the 41st Session of its Administrative Council in Geneva, June 16-27. Perhaps the most controversial issue—one that polarized developing countries and major contributors—was the adoption of a financing plan to amortize an accumulated debt in administrative costs for technical cooperation.

For many years, the ITU executed technical cooperation projects funded by the UN Development Program (UNDP) and received reimbursement for administrative costs based upon a standard formula that paid ITU an amount equivalent to 13 percent of project funding. Money provided under this formula proved insufficient to cover ITU's operational service costs fully and a deficit began to accumulate. The Nairobi Plenipotentiary Conference in 1982 adopted a resolution calling for a "partnership" between ITU and UNDP wherein ITU would execute UNDP technical assistance and technical cooperation projects without regard to full reimbursement of administrative costs. Under the terms of the resolution, estimated costs of administering UNDP projects are included in ITU's annual budget and UNDP reimbursements are included as income. This resolution became effective with the entry into force of the Nairobi Convention on January 1, 1984. ITU claimed it was due additional reimbursement from UNDP for administrative costs incurred up to January 1, 1984. After extensive and protracted negotiations, UNDP agreed that, in exchange for ITU's waiving any further claims for reimbursement, UNDP would make a single payment of \$644,000 to ITU. This agreement failed when UNDP's Governing Council rejected it and refused to make any additional reimbursement to ITU.

ITU had delayed facing the deficit issue. ITU's external auditor noted in his annual report that the issue of a 6.1 million Swiss franc deficit had to be resolved. The 1985 Administrative Council directed ITU's Secretariat to recommend a financing plan to the

1986 Administrative Council. The Secretariat's proposal, calling for immediate transfer of 2.5 million Swiss francs from the Union's capital resources, charging 750,000 Swiss francs to both the 1986 and 1987 regular ITU budget (thus reducing the debt by 4 million Swiss francs as of 1987) and amortizing the balance by similar measures in future years, was adopted after exhaustive discussions.

In finally accepting the financing plan, major contributors acknowledged that the indebtedness which had been allowed to accumulate must be paid, but they demanded assurances that expenditures for technical cooperation in the future would not be allowed to exceed budgeted resources. Developing countries stressed the importance of technical assistance and argued that the resolution adopted at Nairobi required a large and active technical cooperation program. Nonetheless, the Secretariat appeared to understand that technical assistance programs will be watched carefully.

In another important and precedent-setting area, the U.S. Delegation was instrumental in achieving agreement to reduce the length of the second session of the World Administrative Radio Conference for the Planning of High Frequency Bands Allocated to the Broadcasting Service (HFBC 2) from the scheduled 6 weeks and 4 days to 5 weeks and the World Administrative Radio Conference for Mobile Services (WARC MOB-87) from 6 weeks to 5 weeks. These efforts resulted in significant savings to the ITU in translation, documentation, and related administrative costs. They also reduced per diem costs for the United States and other delegations participating in these large international conferences.

The Administrative Council adopted the 1987 Union budget at a level of 107,098 million Swiss francs—an increase of about 5.6 percent above the 1986 level. Despite this increase, however, the 1987 actual assessment against members fell from the 1986 level of 232,200 Swiss francs per contribution unit to 231,800 Swiss francs per contribution unit because a greater portion of the budget was funded from earned income and reserves and less from members' assessments. The U.S. contribution fell from 6,966,000 Swiss francs to 6,954,000 Swiss francs.

CENTER FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT

The Center is in the process of becoming established. Its purpose is to stimulate and accelerate the pace of development of telecommunications infrastructure and services in developing countries by providing advisory services at the precommercial, preinvestment stage of project development.

Important milestones in 1986 for the Center included selection of its first executive officers and continued fund raising efforts. The 21-member Advisory Board of the Center met three times in 1986. At its April meeting, the Board chose 13 candidates to interview from among 150 applicants for the positions of Executive Director and Deputy Director. At a special meeting in June, the Board selected Dietrich Westendoerpf, of the Federal Republic of Germany, Director, and Ahmed Laouyane, of Tunisia, Deputy Director. In November the Advisory Board approved a set of strategic objectives and charged the Executive Directorate with formulating action plans and programs, including project selection criteria and procedures for mobilizing resources. A typical project will include dispatching expert teams to developing countries to assess needs, develop plans, and identify potential funding sources. The initial projects will be identified during 1987.

Funding for the Center is provided by voluntary donations from governments, institutions, and private industry. Contributors from 12 countries raised about 1.5 million Swiss francs in 1986. The Department of State announced a joint U.S. Government-private sector contribution of \$105,000. All contributions from U.S. sources, including the USAID grant of \$50,000, were made payable through the U.S. Foundation for World Communications Development.

U.S. policy toward the Center is developed by the Ad Hoc Group on Communications Development. The Group, formed of U.S. Government and private industry representatives, is chaired by Paul Vishny, General Counsel of the U.S. Telecommunications Suppliers Association, who also serves as the U.S. Representative on the Center for Telecommunications Development's Advisory Board.

PANEL OF EXPERTS

ITU is unusual among international organizations in that it has no permanent constitution. Its Convention is in force only until the next Plenipotentiary Conference, normally held every seventh year. To avoid the time and expense of adopting a basic document at every Plenipotentiary Conference, the Nairobi Conference adopted a resolution establishing a Group of Legal Experts tasked with dividing the Nairobi Convention into two documents—a Constitution and a Convention—and with drafting amendment procedures. These documents will be presented to the 1988 ITU Administrative Council and subsequently to the 1989 Plenipotentiary Conference.

The Group of Experts met in an initial session in Geneva in January 1986. In addition to adopting operating procedures, the Group accepted drafts of a number of articles for the Constitution. The Group will meet again in 1987 to complete work on the Constitution and Convention.

The United States was among the 33 governments sending representatives to the Group of Experts meeting and among the nine governments that submitted proposed material for inclusion in the Constitution and Convention. For the United States, ITU's constitutional drafting procedure is an important opportunity to influence the direction of the ITU and its affiliated organs for many years to come.

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION TECHNICAL BODIES

International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT)

During 1986 the CCITT held numerous Study Group meetings in which U.S. industry and government representatives participated. The CCITT "red books," consisting of over 10,000 pages of approved standards, were published and earned an initial one million Swiss francs for the ITU, thus reducing the assessment levels against member states. The industrial and technical standards developed and promulgated by CCITT are voluntarily accepted worldwide.

Current issues within the CCITT are: consideration of tariff principles governing private leased lines; the use of personal computers in network operations; the Integrated Services Digital Network; and new technologies such as videotex, message handling, and international credit card standards.

One example of significant achievement is U.S. success in gaining both U.S. industry consensus, and subsequent international adoption of an international telephone credit card standard. Through our initiative in getting this standard accepted, U.S. industry calculates it will save over \$100 million annually by eliminating the need to issue multiple cards designed for varying national telephone systems.

International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR)

The CCIR carries out studies and develops international standards and specifications in the field of radio communications. Though nonbinding, the telecommunications industry worldwide generally observes these standards and specifications. Recognized

private operating agencies, as well as other scientific and industrial entities of our private sector, participate in the activities of the CCIR and contribute to the cost of meetings. Participation in the CCIR activities is carried out primarily through the U.S. National CCIR Organization, a longstanding federal advisory committee to the Department of State with over 300 members drawn from the private sector and the federal government.

The CCIR held its XVI Plenary Assembly in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, in May 1986, approving the technical reports and recommendations developed during the past 4-year study cycle. The major achievement at the Assembly was the reelection of Richard S. Kirby, a U.S. citizen, as Director of the CCIR. The CCIR adopted many new recommendations of importance to the U.S. industry, including a proposed recommendation for a high definition television standard for studio use and international program exchange.

International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB)

The major function of the IFRB is to ensure the orderly recording of radio frequencies and satellite orbital positions which national administrations assign to their radio stations, including satellite systems. The Board also assists countries and administrative radio conferences in all matters related to radio spectrum management.

The IFRB was very active in 1986 in its routine work program dealing with the technical examination, coordination, and registration of frequency assignments, and it achieved major gains in the reduction of the longstanding backlog in their processing activities. Steady progress also was made in the extended use of the ITU computer and implementation of the IFRB interim system. In the area of support to radio conferences, the Board was extremely active in preparations for and participation in the Region 2 (Western Hemisphere) Conference on the Planning of the Expanded AM Radio Band, April 1986, and in preparations for the HF-Broadcasting WARC scheduled for early 1987.

A major accomplishment of the IFRB was its finding in September that the U.S.S.R. and two other East European countries were causing harmful radio interference (jamming) to United States and other Western broadcasts in Europe.

Universal Postal Union (UPU)

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Universal Postal Union met in Executive Council from April 22 to May 8, 1986. The budget adopted for 1987 called for a total net expenditure of 22,497,420 Swiss francs. This was a decrease from the 1986 expenditure budget of 24,743 million Swiss francs. Despite the reduction in the expenditure budget compared to 1986, 1987 net budget assessments against members increased because the Executive Council accepted the advice of the International Bureau and, departing from regular practice, made no withdrawals from the reserve fund to finance a portion of the 1987 expenditure budget. Thus, more of the 1987 budget was to be funded from members' contributions than in 1986 or other recent years. In terms of U.S. contributions, the 1987 U.S. assessment of 1,149 million Swiss francs increased 57,000 Swiss francs (about 5.2%) above the 1986 assessment total.

The Executive Council's decision to adopt a floor rate for professional-level UPU officials' salaries of 2.09 Swiss francs to the dollar was opposed by the United States and most of our Western European allies. However, the issue became moot in September 1986 when the UPU dropped its independent system and adopted the remuneration correction factor adjustment system recommended by the International Civil Service Commission of the United Nations.

CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL FOR POSTAL STUDIES

The Council conducted a study in 1986 to establish performance standards by tracing the movement of test mail through the international postal network. The test data developed will enable analysts to pinpoint problem areas and target efforts to improve all categories of mail service.

The Council also approved a framework agreement for international express mail service that will assist developing countries determine service requirements and enter into international express mail networks. These framework agreements should result in greatly expanded international express mail service and increase the areas where express mail service is available.

Both of these Consultative Council endeavors were the culmination of U.S. proposals originally made at the 1984 Hamburg Congress.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The International Labor Organization's membership consists of government, worker, and employer delegations from 150 member countries. In 1986 the Governing Body of the ILO (28 member states and 14 each worker and employer delegations) met 3 times and the Annual Conference was held in June in Geneva.

THE GOVERNING BODY

Financial Problems. As the executive organ, the Governing Body deals with administrative and program issues. The most significant administrative issue in 1986 was the fall in the value of assessed contributions (U.S. dollars) to the ILO measured against its major operating currency (the Swiss franc). Governing Body sessions in February–March, May, and November grappled with the fall of the dollar from its budgeted exchange rate of 2.50 Swiss francs to well below 2.00. The Governing Body at its March session decided to permit the Organization to retain \$26.7 million in cash surplus from the 1984–85 budget rather than credit the funds against members' 1987 contributions. The emergency infusion (which protected the program to 2.06 Swiss francs to the dollar) of additional resources was designed to protect the ILO program until at least the end of 1986.

The Governing Body at its February–March session began an extensive review of different financial mechanisms that could help ILO to ameliorate the impact of rapid exchange rate movement in the 1988–89 biennium. By the close of the November session of the Governing Body, the secretariat had decided on forward cover—contracts for the advance purchase of Swiss francs at a specified U.S. dollar price—as the preferable mechanism. Although the majority of members favored this mechanism, the Governing Body deferred a final decision until 1987 and after further study by governments.

A second, equally serious, financial problem was the nonpayment or partial payment of assessed contributions. Eighty of the 140 members were behind in their payments of assessed contributions by year's end. Most arrearages were modest when compared to ILO's \$127 million annual budget. However, the inability of the United States to pay in full its \$31.5 million assessment placed considerable pressure on the ILO budget. In addition to the \$6.3 million withholding due to the Kassebaum amendment, a temporary deferral of \$19.8 million was made as a result of a Congressional outlay restriction on the Contributions to International Organizations FY 1987 appropriation. The United States paid \$5 mil-

lion in December 1986 towards the assessment and indicated to ILO that approximately \$19 million more would be paid in October 1987 (FY 1988). In response to shortfalls in payments by the United States and others, the Governing Body in March cancelled \$17.3 million in proposed spending. Nonetheless, at year's end, the ILO held very limited cash reserves.

Committee on Employment. Discussions at the 1984 and 1985 sessions of the Conference led to the creation in 1986 of a Governing Body Committee on Employment, which held its first meeting in November. The United States did not favor creation of yet another ILO committee because the Governing Body and Conference schedules already were full. The United States also did not want the resource-constrained ILO budget to fund a new activity. Of greater concern, however, the new body lacked agreed terms of reference and mandate. At the November session of the Governing Body, the United States and Federal Republic of Germany Delegations formally reserved from the text of a resolution provisionally adopting the Committee's terms of reference. The U.S. Government Delegation stated that the proposed mandate lacked clear support from the membership, that it continued to be too broad, and that it exceeded the mandate of the Governing Body and of the ILO itself. U.S. efforts to introduce an alternative, more carefully defined mandate, while unsuccessful, helped to preserve the option of reopening the question at the Committee's next session in November 1987.

International Debt. The question of a possible role for the ILO to assist developing countries with their international debt arose in the November session of the Governing Body in followup to the debt resolution passed by the Annual Conference, in June 1986. During the course of debate over a resolution sponsored by several developing country government delegations, the U.S. Government Delegation indicated it could support appropriate activities for the ILO to deal with employment creation and the social consequences of external debt—principally through informal consultations between the staff of the ILO and counterparts in the IMF and World Bank. The United States opposed convening in 1987 the preparatory expert-level and high-level (ministerial) meetings mandated in the resolution, because they would be politicized and would deal with issues entirely beyond the ILO's expertise and mandate. During the debate, the U.S. Government Delegationsaid that the United States would not participate in either meeting and that, if the resolution were pressed, it would call for a vote. The U.K., Federal Republic of Germany, and Japan echoed the U.S. position. The resolution, nonetheless, was adopted by a vote of 37 to 10 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions.

ILO ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The 3 week ILO Annual Conference met in Geneva, June 4-25. Approximately 1,800 government, worker, and employer delegates from 140 countries attended. The Conference agreed on new international standards to protect workers from asbestos hazards. It urged governments to adopt policies aimed at reducing youth unemployment, creating jobs through small enterprise development, and counteracting the negative employment consequences of international debt.

U.S. Secretary of Labor William E. Brock, citing the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl as an example of the serious safety and health hazards which can be associated with some new technologies, called on the ILO and its members to intensify efforts to share information on such hazards. Secretary Brock pledged to make greater use of the ILO's occupational health hazard alert system in developing American safety and health standards.

Technical Agenda Items

The heart of the ILO's Annual Conference is its standard-setting activities, which include the development of conventions, that when ratified by governments, are legally binding. In recent years, many ILO members have advocated slowing the pace of developing new standards to allow governments time to act on those already on the books (the ILO has adopted 162 conventions since its creation in 1919).

Asbestos. The 1986 ILO Conference, therefore, adopted only two new standards: a convention and a recommendation on asbestos. The convention requires that ratifying governments develop national programs to prevent worker exposure to asbestos health hazards, including worker exposure limits and effective inspection programs. The convention prohibits the use of crocidolite—a type of asbestos considered particularly dangerous—as well as the spraying of asbestos. The question of banning other types of asbestos was left to national governments to decide. Special provisions deal with demolition of buildings containing asbestos, the handling and cleaning of work clothing, and environmental and medical surveillance. The recommendation on asbestos covers many of these same questions in greater detail.

Youth. Unlike the discussion on asbestos, the discussion on youth did not result in new standards, but it did lead to nonbinding conclusions. The work of the committee on youth was complicated by the efforts of some delegates to raise extraneous political issues. The U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European countries, for ex-

ample, introduced a resolution which attempted to link youth unemployment to the arms race. While this resolution was never seriously considered, the youth committee did adopt a paragraph sponsored by its worker and employer members urging that "socially unproductive activities which pose a threat to peace (should be) redirected towards socially and economically productive activities"

The Conference conclusions on youth recognized that the modern sector of the economy in many countries has only a limited capacity to absorb the estimated one billion youth who will be in the world labor force by the year 2000—84 percent of them in developing countries. The conclusions advocate, therefore, that more resources should be focused on employment creation in the informal sector, self-employment, and jobs for youth in the rural agricultural and non-agricultural sectors of the economy. The Conference also urged better designed national training and education programs to provide "employable skills" to young job seekers.

Small Enterprise Development. The Conference conclusions on small enterprise development dealt primarily with employment creation. The U.S. Government representative noted, for example, that two-thirds of the 43 million new jobs created in the United States since 1960 were in small businesses. The Conference called on governments to adopt policies to promote small enterprise development, including "simplifying and streamlining" government regulations which retard the establishment of small enterprises. This latter point was qualified by an explicit recognition of the need for "fully protecting workers' rights."

To assist entrepreneurs to establish new enterprises the ILO's conclusions recommend the formulation of national small enterprise development policies which include effective management training programs, the creation of technology centers, and financial assistance programs (including credit guarantees).

Additional Resolutions

International Debt. Perhaps the most controversial issue during the Conference was a resolution on the implications of international debt for employment. The worker delegates at the Conference, joined by a majority of governments, particularly from Latin America, supported adoption of a resolution calling on the ILO to become more involved in finding solutions to the debt problem. The resolution urged creditor governments, among other things, to extend debt repayment schedules, reduce interest rates, and stabilize foreign exchange rates and commodity prices. It also

called for a special "high-level" ILO meeting involving key government labor and finance officials, the heads of international financial organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, and worker and employer representatives. The purpose of this meeting would be to examine "the impact of international trade and financial and monetary policies on employment and poverty."

The sponsors of this resolution argued that the austerity programs required to cope with the debt crisis are leading to higher unemployment in many countries. They insisted that the ILO should work with the international financial organizations and with debtor and creditor governments to find more equitable solutions. Although government delegations of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Japan, and the Federal Republic of Germany voted against the resolution on the grounds that the ILO lacked both the responsibility and expertise to deal with international financial questions, it was adopted by a wide margin (318 to 11 (U.S.), with 32 abstentions).

Structure. Almost equally controversial was the adoption, after more than 20 years of debate, of a resolution containing proposals to change the ILO's structure. Most of these proposals concern the ILO Governing Body. Specifically, the proposals would expand the Governing Body from 56 to 112 members and make all seats elective (presently, 10 of the 28 government seats are nonelective and reserved for the "states of chief industrial importance": the United States, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, India, China, and Brazil). However, under ILO electoral procedures, the United States would be assured its permanent seat in the Governing Body. Other proposals relate to the election of the ILO's Director General, the quorum needed for valid conference votes, and procedures for considering resolutions which condemn ILO members.

The major point of controversy stemmed from Soviet demands for guaranteed seats on the employer benches of the Governing Body. The employers have steadfastly refused to elect any communist "employers" to the Governing Body, arguing that they are, in reality, agents of governments and not free employers.

The Soviet Delegation found itself virtually without support for its proposal for guaranteed employer seats (the majority of ILO members supported the ILO's principle of tripartism, including the autonomy of the worker and employer groups). Unable to block final agreement on the other structure proposals, the Soviets began a campaign that involved a series of procedural maneuvers during the opening days of the Conference which for 5 days blocked the start of work of committees working on resolutions

and the application of ILO standards. Soviet opposition stemmed from the alleged underrepresentation of communist employers on the committees, i.e., virtually the same complaint the Soviets have with the employer benches in the Governing Body. The Soviets continued their tactics when the structure proposals were presented for a preliminary decision near the end of the Conference by insisting on time-wasting votes.

In the end, the Conference overwhelmingly approved the structure proposals as amendments to the ILO constitution and standing orders. The constitutional amendments will be submitted to governments for ratification.

Other Political Issues

The committee dealing with the application of standards—normally controversial because of its focus on significant human rights violations—was relatively quiet. Because of delays in beginning its work due to Soviet opposition to its composition, the committee considered far fewer cases than in previous years. Even more significantly, no cases from the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe were considered. Of the three cases identified for committee discussion, one (Poland's violation of trade union rights) could not be discussed since that government sent no delegation to the Conference in view of its announced withdrawal from the ILO. Two other cases (involving Nicaragua and Romania) could not be considered because those governments refused to discuss the allegations in the committee. The boycott of the ILO's supervisory machinery provoked a strong reaction from the worker and employer members of the committee as well as from many of the government delegations.

The standards committee cited Iran for "continued failure" to end its blatant discrimination against the Baha'i religious sect. It adopted "special paragraphs" expressing concern over the nonapplication of ratified conventions in Pakistan (forced labor and fee-charging employment agencies) and Bangladesh (treatment of tribal populations).

In other actions, the Conference adopted proposals to help the ILO offset budget shortfalls arising from the declining value of the dollar. The Conference endorsed a Governing Body decision for ILO to retain its \$26.7 million surplus from 1984-85 rather than credit these funds to 1987 contributions. It also strongly urged, over U.S. Government objections, economic sanctions against South Africa as pressure to eliminate apartheid.

World Meteorological Organization

The First International Meteorological Congress established the International Meteorological Organization (IMO) as a nongovernmental organization in 1873 in Vienna. In 1951 the IMO transferred its functions and responsibilities to the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). The WMO is an intergovernmental organization and a specialized agency of the United Nations. In 1986 there were 159 members of the WMO including 154 states and 5 territories. All states and territories with meteorological services are eligible for membership in the WMO.

Participation in the WMO enables members to exchange freely meteorological and hydrological data. WMO members thus have access to world-wide data on storms and weather changes which may affect personal safety or crop yield, and are, therefore, better able to take safety measures and make more accurate agricultural plans. As a result of its size and international interests, the United States obtains substantial benefits from the information it receives from its participation in the WMO. This information permits the United States to make longer-range and more accurate coastal forecasts, particularly for dangerous storms, and supports research to improve long-range forecasts throughout the world.

The supreme body of the WMO is the Congress, which consists of all members. It meets every 4 years to conduct a thorough review of all program areas, establish general policies and budgetary requirements for the next 4-year period, and to conduct elections for officers of the Organization and members to the Executive Council. The Congress (Ninth) last met in 1983 and will meet again in 1987. The Executive Council (EC) is a subsidiary body of the Congress, and meets at least once a year to supervise the implementation of the programs that the WMO Congress approves. The EC is composed of 36 directors of national meteorological or hydrometeorological services who serve on the Council in their personal capacity for a 4-year term.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—1986

The 38th Session of the Executive Council (EC), held in Geneva in June, established a plan of program activities for 1987 within the framework of the program and budget ceiling approved by the Ninth Congress. The EC reviewed, in detail, all program areas, and received an in-depth report on the activities of the WMO's Commission for Basic Systems—responsible for coordinating observations and the dissemination of weather data. The EC

also established, for the first time, a comprehensive long-term Plan for all major program areas which will be submitted to the Tenth Congress for approval. The plan covers a 10-year period (1988–97) and consists of two parts: (1) overall policy guidance and strategy, including the scientific and technical objectives of the WMO, and (2) more detailed plans for the individual scientific and technical programs of the WMO.

As a consequence of the nuclear accident at Chernobyl in April 1986, the EC decided that international procedures should be established by WMO for coordinated action on meteorological aspects of accidents involving transboundary release of hazardous materials. The EC agreed to establish an *ad hoc* group of experts to examine this matter—in coordination with other international organizations, particularly the IAEA—and make recommendations regarding an internationally coordinated action program, which could include use of the WMO's Global Telecommunication System in an early warning network.

On budget issues, and in accordance with U.S.-initiated reform efforts in the United Nations, the EC agreed to recommend to the Tenth Congress (May 1987) the establishment of a Financial Advisory Committee which would be comprised of major donors and a number of developing states, and would submit recommendations—by consensus—to the EC, Congress, and WMO Secretary General on financial and budgetary matters.

Major Programs

WORLD WEATHER WATCH

The EC reaffirmed the importance of the World Weather Watch (WWW) as the basic program of the WMO, and its activities as essential for the implementation of the other programs such as agricultural, aeronautical, and marine meteorology as well as those undertaken jointly with other international bodies. The Council agreed that WMO should improve global and regional systems for gathering, transmitting, and processing information. The EC also agreed to use new observation systems, including those onboard ships and aircraft, and systems placed on drifting buoys in the oceans. The EC also supported the use of innovative demonstration programs for the implementation of new observing systems as well as wider use of satellites for telecommunications.

WORLD CLIMATE PROGRAM

The WMO established the World Climate Program (WCP) in 1979 in response to widespread concern about long-term changes in the global climate and consequent economic, social, and environmental effects. In 1986 the EC discussed the various aspects of the WCP, and members acknowledged the value of its four components: World Climate Data Program (WCDP), World Climate Applications Program (WCAP), World Climate Impact Studies Program (WCIP), and World Climate Research Program (WCRP). The primary responsibility for the planning and execution of the WCDP and WCAP is borne by WMO. The UN Environment Program (UNEP) has accepted responsibility for the WCIP in close collaboration with WMO, while the WCRP is conducted jointly by WMO and the International Council for Scientific Unions (ICSU) under a formal agreement between the two organizations.

The timely availability and accessibility of climate data remain an important part of the WCP's studies on climate applications, impact, and research. In addition, the program gives attention to other important subject areas such as the effects of "greenhouse gases," depletion of the ozone, urban meteorology, biometeorology, drought, and the UN Action Plan to combat desertification. The WCRP seeks to develop techniques for predicting climate and climate change and the extent of man's influence on climate. The WCRP circulated an implementation plan for this program in the fall of 1985. The EC discussed the plan at its meeting in 1986, and decided to proceed with the WCRP as proposed.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM

The serious water problems facing many regions of the world, ranging from the lack of water supplies in drought-stricken regions to major flood hazards in other regions, have emphasized the need for efficient assessment, development, and management of water resources. In order to respond to this need, the Hydrology and Water Resources Programme (HWRP) was established as one of the major programs of the WMO. The overall objective of the program is to ensure the assessment and forecasting of the quantity and quality of water resources both for different sectoral uses and for hazard mitigation.

The HWRP aims to achieve this objective by promoting world-wide cooperation in the evaluation of water resources and in the development of these resources through the coordinated establishment of hydrological networks and services, including data collection and processing, hydrological forecastings and warnings,

and the supply of meteorological and hydrological data for design purposes.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Commission for Atmospheric Sciences (CAS) has the lead role within WMO for promoting and coordinating members' research efforts. Activities in 1986 emphasized weather forecasting on all scales, tropical meteorology, and measurement of air pollution. Environmental pollution activities include research on acid rain and the monitoring and exchange of pollutants between the atmosphere and the oceans. The Organization's Research and Development Program continued to support tropical meteorology and forecasting of tropical storms with the expansion of regional groups dealing with this subject in the Southwest Pacific area. A major conference, bringing together researchers and forecasters, was held in Bangkok in December 1986.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The technical cooperation activities of the WMO are financed from the UN Development Program (UNDP), the WMO Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP), trust funds (TF), and the WMO regular budget. In 1986 a total of 131 WMO members benefited from technical assistance provided from these resources. The major source of funds for WMO's technical cooperation activities continues to be the UNDP which provides roughly 55 percent of the total contributions.

VOLUNTARY COOPERATION PROGRAM

The WMO established the Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP) in 1967 at U.S. initiative. The VCP provides equipment and training to developing countries to permit them to participate in the WMO World Weather Watch and other programs. This global participation enables WMO to provide members the information they need about the world's climate. Global participation is also necessary for U.S. interests to support civil aviation, ship traffic, and the military.

Members may make contributions to the VCP in cash payments to the Voluntary Cooperation Fund, or as in-kind assistance in the form of equipment, expert services, and fellowships. In 1986 resources from the VCP fund were allocated by the Executive Council for spare parts, experts' travel, fellowships and several high priority VCP coordinated programs. VCP in-kind contributions, which comprises roughly 95% of the overall VCP, record-

ed donations from members in response to specific requests from developing countries totaling approximately \$5 million in 1986.* The United States pledged \$1.723 million to the VCP in 1986.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The WMO Education and Training Program is an important mechanism for the effective transfer of knowledge and proven methodology to operational personnel in national meteorological, hydrometeorological, and hydrological services.

National and regional training centers use training publications, including compendia of lecture notes in various fields, and the WMO plans to increase their value by translating them into all the official languages of the WMO. To assist its Regional Meteorological Training Centers, the WMO implemented a training book loan service on a trial basis for the next 2 years. Members agreed that WMO training courses, seminars, workshops, and symposia should be continued, bearing in mind the special need for training instructors and technicians.

BUDGET

As a consequence of unpaid contributions, and a fall in the U.S. dollar relative to the Swiss franc, the WMO experienced serious cash-flow problems in 1986, which led to cost-cutting measures including a freeze on all new hiring, and postponement of some meetings and other activities. The United States was unable to make full payment of its 1986 assessed contribution to the WMO, primarily as a result of a 20 percent cut in funding mandated by the Kassebaum-Solomon amendment which calls for budgetary reform in the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The shortfall in the U.S. contribution in 1986 amounted to over \$900,000. Although WMO has traditionally adopted its program/budget by consensus and has demonstrated a high degree of fiscal responsibility, the EC recommended to the Tenth session of Congress (1987) the establishment of the Financial Advisory Committee mentioned earlier in an effort to be responsive to calls for budgetary reform in the UN system. In addition, the EC considered adoption of a number of other measures, including moving to a biennial budget, to ease the financial difficulties being experienced by the Organization. The Tenth Congress is expected to take action on these and other financial matters.

*Annual Report of the World Meteorological Organization—1986

The budget for 1987, the fourth year of the Ninth Financial Period (1984-87), was established by the 38th Session of the EC at \$21,112,500. Consistent with WMO's long-standing budgetary policy, the 1987 budget maintained zero real program growth.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Since the beginning of the nuclear era, those involved with nuclear energy have recognized that some of the nuclear materials and technology used in peaceful nuclear development programs could be diverted and adapted for use in the production of nuclear explosives. It was also widely recognized that the further spread of nuclear explosives would pose a serious threat to the peace and security of all states. Consequently, members of the international community came to realize that if the many peaceful benefits of nuclear energy were to be made widely available, some mechanism was essential to provide credible assurance that nuclear material and technology in peaceful nuclear programs continued to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Prompted by this realization, the United States led the effort to establish the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1957. The Statute of the IAEA clearly reflects the dual role the IAEA must play in the international nuclear community, and specifies that the IAEA should seek to "accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world . . ." and ensure "so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose."

Thus, the IAEA is called on to promote the safe and peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to deter the misuse of nuclear material for nonpeaceful purposes. To assist in the development of nuclear energy, the IAEA provides technical cooperation to many of its developing Member States. The IAEA performs its deterrent role through the application of international safeguards.

The safeguards system is a unique system of international verification of national commitments. On-site inspections by the IAEA include audits of facility records, independent measurements to verify facility records and national reports, and use of instrumental surveillance and seals. The system is not designed to control or regulate national nuclear programs. Rather, its purpose is to deter, through threat of timely detection, the diversion of significant quantities of nuclear material from peaceful to nonpeaceful purposes.

Safeguards and technical cooperation represent the primary activities of the IAEA. However, the IAEA also maintains a program of active support to its members in a number of areas, including nuclear safety, transport of nuclear material, and nuclear waste management.

The day-to-day implementation of IAEA programs is conducted by the IAEA Secretariat, headed by Director General Hans Blix (Sweden), and located in Vienna. Policy review and guidance is provided, *inter alia*, by the 35-member Board of Governors which generally meets in February and June, and in September in conjunction with the annual meeting of the IAEA General Conference. The General Conference is open to participation by all of the 113 members of the IAEA, and serves as a forum for discussion of a range of issues among members.

The IAEA has long been regarded as one of the most effective and well-managed international technical organizations. The outstanding quality of the organization's work and its ability to respond quickly and effectively to members' needs was dramatically highlighted by the April 1986 Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident in the Soviet Union.

CHERNOBYL AND THE IAEA

The Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident was the worst civil nuclear accident in the history of nuclear power. As part of their initial response to the accident, Soviet officials invited IAEA Director General Blix to tour the damaged reactor in early May 1986. Dr. Blix was thus the first foreign national to visit the site of the accident. Subsequent to Blix's visit, the Soviets began to provide information on radiation levels in Soviet territories to the IAEA and the IAEA quickly became the primary focal point for much of the international community's response to the accident.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

While its February 1986 meeting was brief and routine, subsequent meetings of the IAEA Board of Governors in 1986 were dominated by the compelling need to respond quickly and effectively to the Chernobyl accident. Shortly after the accident, in May 1986, the Board met in special session to review the information then available regarding the accident and to begin consideration of means to enhance international cooperation in nuclear safety. In particular, the Board began review of preliminary proposals to expand the IAEA's nuclear safety program, which had been in operation for over a decade.

The Board continued consideration of ways to expand the IAEA's work in nuclear safety at its regular session in June 1986. At that time, the Board agreed to add \$2,030,000 to the 1987 IAEA budget to fund expanded work in nuclear safety, but reserved its views on some of the specific tasks to be undertaken, pending further study during the summer. At the same time, the Board concurred in plans to convene an expert group to negotiate two international conventions on nuclear safety, one dealing with the provision of emergency assistance in the event of a nuclear accident and the other with prompt notification of nuclear accidents with potential transboundary implications. This group met and successfully completed these negotiations in July 1986. The Board also endorsed convening a meeting of experts to review and analyze the technical causes and consequences of the accident. This post-accident review, which brought together over 800 experts in August 1986, was characterized by in-depth, detailed discussion among those attending, including experts from the Soviet Union who presented a briefing and played an active and constructive role. Finally, the June Board endorsed a recommendation to convene in September a special, ministerial-level meeting of the IAEA General Conference specifically to address nuclear safety. A follow-on meeting of nuclear safety experts met in November 1986 to provide further guidance on the future direction of IAEA's work in nuclear safety and radiation protection. The Board continued to monitor these issues including review of the two proposed international conventions at its September meeting. The Board also considered *inter alia* proposals to increase the size of the Board, but deferred action pending further consultations. At a second special session in December 1986, the Board gave final approval to specific proposals for expanded work by IAEA in nuclear safety in 1987 and beyond. Thus, in 1986 the Board held two special sessions in addition to its regular meetings and provided strong leadership and direction for the enormous volume of additional work tasked to IAEA by its members in response to the Chernobyl accident.

GENERAL CONFERENCE

The regular session of the 1986 IAEA General Conference was preceded by a 3-day ministerial-level Special Session of the General Conference. This Special Session, attended by representatives of over 80 nations, was convened specifically to address nuclear safety and radiation protection issues in the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident and to consider means to enhance international cooperation in these areas. In addition, participants at the

Special Session approved and opened for signature the two international conventions negotiated in July on reporting nuclear accidents and provision of assistance in the event of such accidents. Secretary of Energy John Herrington headed the U.S. Delegation to this important meeting and signed both Conventions on behalf of the United States.

The 1986 regular General Conference convened the week following the special General Conference and dispatched its work expeditiously. Election of members to the 1986-87 Board proceeded routinely as did consideration of the Agency's proposed program and budget for 1987-88, funding for safeguards, and debate regarding possible expansion of the Board of Governors. Potentially controversial issues involving Israeli and South African participation in the IAEA were successfully set aside. In particular, the General Conference agreed by consensus to adjourn debate over the question of Israeli participation, thus underscoring a widely-shared conviction among IAEA members that this issue has no place in IAEA proceedings. Proposed punitive action against South Africa was deferred for consideration at the 1987 General Conference. Many IAEA members praised the IAEA Secretariat for its exemplary performance in response to the Chernobyl accident.

IAEA PROGRAMS

Safeguards

While much of the IAEA's work in 1986 was dominated by nuclear safety issues, the Agency continued to dedicate considerable effort to effective implementation of international safeguards. The IAEA safeguards system serves vital national security and nonproliferation interests for all nations. Consequently, efforts to improve and strengthen safeguards remain a continuing priority. The Agency seeks to meet its ever-increasing safeguards responsibilities by the effective use of sophisticated technology and well-trained staff. In 1986 the United States continued to play a major role in efforts to strengthen safeguards, improving both the effectiveness and efficiency of the system. The U.S. Program of Technical Assistance to Safeguards provided over \$6 million in voluntary contributions towards this effort.

In 1986 the IAEA conducted 2054 safeguards inspections; this represents an 87 percent increase in the number of inspections since 1980. Continued progress in the implementation of advanced techniques is reflected by the 18 percent increase in the use of nondestructive assay equipment during inspections. This tech-

nique permits prompt verification of nuclear materials without the need for shipment and laboratory analysis of samples.

High priority was also given in 1986 to promoting more effective management, maintenance, and procurement of safeguards equipment. This emphasis is designed in part to assist the IAEA in incorporating and utilizing new and advanced safeguards equipment as it becomes available, thus encouraging continual updating and the application of the most effective safeguards techniques possible. In some cases the IAEA is now developing or deploying the second or third generation of technology to meet a specific safeguards need.

During 1986 the overall scope of IAEA safeguards application continued to expand as new nuclear facilities were brought on line. The IAEA also pursued negotiation of a safeguards agreement with the Peoples' Republic of China, in response to the 1985 Chinese voluntary offer to accept IAEA safeguards on certain of their nuclear installations. Following North Korea's adherence to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1986, the IAEA also initiated safeguards discussions with North Korean officials, as mandated by the Treaty. Further expansion in the scope of safeguards coverage in 1987 is likely.

Technical Cooperation

The IAEA's Program of Technical Assistance and Cooperation is a significant part of the Agency's total operation. In 1986 the IAEA provided technical cooperation to approximately 70 of its 113 members. This assistance takes a variety of forms. A considerable portion of the technical assistance and cooperation program involves assistance in applications of radioisotopes and radiation in agriculture, medicine, biology, hydrology, and industry. Emphasis is also placed on cooperation in nuclear power and nuclear safety, with the remainder of the program devoted to other nuclear energy activities, including nuclear physics and chemistry, prospecting, mining and processing of uranium and thorium ores, and general nuclear energy development. Equipment, training and fellowships, and the services of experts in the nuclear field are also provided.

While the IAEA's safeguards program as well as IAEA laboratories and other programs are funded from the assessed budget of the Agency, the technical cooperation program is funded from voluntary contributions. In 1986, the United States pledged approximately \$7 million of the target figure of \$30 million sought for contributions to the 1986 Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund. In addition, the United States provided over \$3 million

in support of training courses, expert services, fellowships and technical cooperation projects in IAEA members party to either the NPT or the Treaty of Tlatelolco (which establishes a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Latin America).

In conjunction with its work in nuclear safety, the IAEA provides Operational Safety Review Teams (OSART) to IAEA members requesting them to help review safety measures at specific nuclear facilities. In 1986, following Chernobyl, the IAEA shifted funding for these teams from the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Program to the regular budget, to emphasize the importance of this work to all IAEA members, not just the developing states.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In presenting the 1986 IAEA Annual Report to the 41st UNGA, IAEA Director General Blix devoted considerable attention to the Chernobyl accident and the IAEA's response, summarizing the many and varied accomplishments of the Agency in enhancing international cooperation in nuclear safety. Blix also responded to those who challenged the continued use of nuclear energy in light of Chernobyl by reviewing the role of nuclear power in supplying international energy needs. In this connection, he touched on alternative energy sources and their drawbacks, concluding that all forms of energy generation carry some risk.

The Director General then emphasized that attention to Chernobyl had not diminished the Agency's work in other important areas, including, among others, work in nuclear power, nuclear waste management and in nuclear applications in agriculture, hydrology, health, and basic research.

In reviewing the status of the Agency's safeguards activities in 1986, Blix stressed that "the IAEA safeguards system is a service which the Agency provides to sovereign states to create confidence that they are complying with obligations they have assumed for the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear installations. This confidence-building function of the safeguards system has great practical significance both globally and regionally." Blix went on to describe the expansion in safeguards coverage in 1986, and the status of safeguards negotiations with China. He further noted that "unfortunately" there had been no progress in 1986 in safeguards discussions with South Africa.

Blix summarized some of the lessons of 1986, stating that nuclear development could not proceed in the absence of effective nuclear safety measures, that "international rules and regulations must not lag behind the leaps in scientific and technological

advancement,” and that cooperation among nations is essential to reduce the risks of technological advancements. He concluded by noting that “the remarkable international solidarity and cooperation which we have witnessed in the wake of the Chernobyl accident is an example of how the world can draw together to try to ensure that technology will be used safely for the benefit of mankind.”

Following the Director General’s presentation (November 11), the 41st UNGA adopted a consensus resolution (A/41/36) taking note of the report, stressing the importance of the work of the IAEA, and urging that all states pursue “effective and harmonious” cooperation through IAEA, and sign both international conventions on nuclear safety if they had not already done so.

Part 3

Trusteeship and Dependent Areas

INTRODUCTION

UN concern for decolonization stems from the principles of equality and self-determination espoused in the UN Charter. Chapter VII of the Charter sets forth the responsibilities of states for "the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." These "non-self-governing territories" are considered annually by the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Committee of 24)* and by the General Assembly's Fourth Committee. The C-24 makes suggestions and recommendations to the Fourth Committee regarding (a) implementation of UNGA Resolution 1514 of 1960, the "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples"; (b) specific issues affecting the decolonization process, such as the activities of foreign economic and military interests in non-self-governing territories; and (c) the activities of specialized agencies and other UN bodies in those territories.

The United States is firmly committed to self-determination for all peoples. However, it does not agree with the view of the C-24 that equates self-determination only with independence. The United States views independence as only one possible outcome of self-determination, and that the status of a territory must reflect the freely-expressed wishes of its people. UNGA Resolution 1541 of 1960 explicitly recognizes statuses other than independence as legitimate outcomes of the act of self-determination. It lists three ways of achieving self-determination: (1) independence, (2) free as-

*Members of the C-24 in 1986 were: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

sociation with an independent state, or (3) merger with an independent state. Thus, the outcome of the act of self-determination should be determined by the people of the territory in conjunction with the administering authority, not by a UN body involved in reviewing the administration of the area.

It is also the position of the United States that whether or not military bases interfere with the right to self-determination can only be decided on a case-by-case basis, after careful examination of the particular circumstances of the territory in question. The United States has consistently opposed General Assembly resolutions calling for specialized agency cooperation with, and assistance to, "national liberation movements."

Special Committee (Committee of 24)

Although the number of non-self-governing nations has declined over the years, the United Nations still has great interest in areas it considers "colonial." During 1986, the Committee of 24 considered the situation in Namibia, Western Sahara, Gibraltar, Tokelau, Pitcairn Island, St. Helena, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI), Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands, Anguilla, U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

The United States does not recognize C-24 jurisdiction over Puerto Rico and TTPI. The General Assembly removed Puerto Rico from its list of non-self-governing territories in 1953, and the Charter assigns responsibility for TTPI solely to the Security Council and through it to the Trusteeship Council. The United States does not participate in C-24 discussions on either of these issues.

On January 30, the U.K. Permanent Representative informed the C-24 of his government's decision henceforth not to take part in the work of the Committee. He stated that the small number of remaining British territories, while retaining the right to choose independence, wished to remain in close association with the United Kingdom. Therefore, as far as the United Kingdom was concerned, the colonial era was over, and there seemed to be no need for further UN study of these territories' affairs. The United Kingdom pledged to continue to fulfill its obligation to report by letter to the Secretary-General on conditions in its territories in accordance with Article 73(e) of the UN Charter.

The C-24 held 23 meetings during 1986. Opening the first session on March 18, the UN Secretary General noted the Committee's special responsibilities for Namibia and called on the Committee to exercise fiscal restraint in view of the United Nations' budgetary difficulties. At the same meeting, the C-24 elected Bernahu Dinka of Ethiopia as its Chairman. In his speech he described the role of the C-24 in promoting decolonization, stated that Namibia was the most urgent agenda item, and criticized South Africa for its aggressive and destabilizing activities vis-à-vis its neighboring states. The C-24 then adopted the Chairman's suggestions relating to the work of the organization. Oscar Oramas-Oliva of Cuba served as Acting Chairman of the C-24 for the remainder of 1986 following the recall of Bernahu Dinka to Addis Ababa in April.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (TTPI)

TTPI consisted of more than 2,100 small islands known collectively as Micronesia, with a total land area of about 700 square miles in an area of the Pacific equivalent in size to the continental United States. About 100 of the islands are inhabited, with a total estimated population of 136,500. The Trust Territory consisted of three distinct island groups: the Marianas (excluding Guam), the Carolines, and the Marshalls.

Formerly administered by Japan under a League of Nations mandate, the islands came under U.S. control due to World War II. After the founding of the United Nations and its Trusteeship System, the United States and UN Security Council concluded an agreement on July 18, 1947, making the islands a strategic trust territory under U.S. administration. The Trust Territory has been administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior since 1951.

The peoples of the Trust Territory, on their own initiative, chose to divide politically into four separate entities. In 1975, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) voted to join the United States in commonwealth status following termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. The Northern Mariana Islands began to function as a separate administrative unit with a popularly-elected governor and legislature. In 1978, the people in the districts of Truk, Yap, Ponape, and Kosrae in the Carolines, voted in a constitutional referendum to establish the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). In 1979, they formed federal and state governments. The Marshall Islands (RMI) also voted to form a separate

constitutional government in 1979. In 1981, the people of Palau, in the Carolines, voted to establish the Republic of Palau.

From 1969, representatives of the islands negotiated with the United States to determine their political status upon termination of the Trusteeship. In addition to the Northern Mariana Islands' decision to become a U.S. commonwealth, the peoples of the FSM, the Marshall Islands, and Palau, voting in Trusteeship Council-observed plebiscites, approved a compact of free association. Under each compact, the areas would become sovereign states responsible for their own domestic and foreign affairs, with the United States retaining responsibility for their defense and security alone. After the governments of the FSM and RMI subsequently approved the compact in accordance with their constitutional processes, the U.S. Congress approved it in December 1985. The President signed it in January 1986.

Free association is a relationship defined in the compacts which is terminable by either or both parties, provides for self-government, both domestically and in foreign affairs, and recognizes the Freely Associated States as sovereign states. The United States is obligated to provide economic assistance for the life of the compacts and continues to have responsibility for the defense and security of the island states.

The commonwealth status for the Northern Mariana Islands gives full U.S. citizenship to its domiciliary inhabitants and self-government in accordance with the constitution of the Northern Mariana Islands and as defined in the covenant adopted by the people of the Marianas in 1975.

In Palau the 1983 plebiscite on the compact was accompanied by a referendum question to reconcile the provisions of a section of the Palauan constitution with certain defense and security provisions of the Compact. Under terms of the constitution, the question required approval of not less than 75 percent of those voting. Despite majority (62 percent) approval in the February 1983 plebiscite, the compact did not achieve the required 75 percent. Subsequent negotiations between the United States and Palau resulted in a revised compact, submitted for approval in an internal referendum in September 1984.

The compact failed to obtain the 75-percent approval vote. Following new negotiations, a further revised compact was signed on January 10, 1986. That compact was approved by a UN-observed plebiscite on February 21, 1986, with a 72-percent affirmative vote, later ratified through Palauan constitutional processes. On October 16 the U.S. Congress approved the Compact with Palau. The President signed it on November 14. Again, a court

challenge in Palau prompted a Palauan Supreme Court decision that a section of the compact was sufficiently important that the entire compact would require a 75-percent approval rate. On December 2, 1986, Palauans voted in a UN-observed plebiscite in which the Compact received 64 percent, not the required 75 percent.

Trusteeship Council Consideration

The Trusteeship Council was set up to oversee the 11 UN trusteeships under the international trusteeship system established in Chapter XII of the Charter. TTPI is the sole remaining territory under the trusteeship system. The Trusteeship Council consists of the five permanent members of the Security Council: China, France, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, and the United States, which is the administering authority. China, however, does not participate in the Council's work.

The Trusteeship Council met several times during 1986. On January 9 the United States requested a special session of the Trusteeship Council to consider sending an observer mission to Palau to observe the February 21 plebiscite there on the revised compact of free association signed with the United States. At the session on February 4 and 6, the Council concurred with the request.

The 53rd session of the Council, at which the United States presented its annual report for the year ending on September 30, 1985, took place from May 12-June 4. In her opening statement on May 12, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne noted that the "fundamental objectives of the trusteeship in Micronesia have been achieved." Moreover, the unanimous decision by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) to admit the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Northern Marianas as associated members was a "welcome sign that the international community recognizes that the Micronesian states are ready to emerge from their former tutelage and assume their rightful places in the world and its international organizations."

Representatives from the FSM, Palau, NMI, and RMI spoke to the Council, all calling for termination of the trusteeship without delay. The Council also heard petitioners, some of them TTPI inhabitants and others from different parts of the Pacific. Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, stressed this theme in his May 16 address to the Council on the future of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

UN resolutions have recognized "three basic forms as acceptable outcomes of the process of self-determination: independence, free association with an existing state, or integration into an existing state." Three of the entities had chosen free association while the fourth had chosen integration, all in free acts of self-determination. Ambassador Walters lauded the achievement of the Council in having overseen the trusteeship, which had now achieved its goals. "The time has come to terminate the trusteeship," he said.

On May 28, 1986, the Trusteeship Council, by a vote of 3 to 1, passed Resolution 2183 (LIII), which noted that the peoples "have freely exercised their right to self-determination in plebiscites observed by visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council" and considered that the United States had "satisfactorily discharged its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement and that it is appropriate for the agreement to be terminated." Through consultations, the parties were requested to "agree on a date not later than 30 September 1986 for full entry into force of the Compact of Free Association and Commonwealth Covenant, and to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of that date."

Pursuant to UNTC Resolution 2183, and after extensive bilateral consultations, the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the Republic of the Marshall Islands was implemented on October 21, 1986, through an agreement between the two governments.

On November 3, 1986, the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the Federated States of Micronesia was similarly implemented, and the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America was made fully effective.

Also on November 3, President Ronald Reagan issued a Presidential Proclamation noting that the United States had fulfilled its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement with respect to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia, and that they are self-governing and no longer subject to the trusteeship, in accordance with the wishes of the peoples concerned. On October 23, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was notified by letter of these completed and then-prospective actions and was asked to circulate the letter as an official document of the Security Council, which he did.

U.S. TERRITORIES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Committee of 24 considered American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands on August 4. As the administrative authority concerned, the United States presents statements to the C-24 on the U.S. small territories and provides information on these territories to the UN Secretariat, in accordance with Article 73(e) of the UN Charter.

American Samoa

American Samoa is an unincorporated and unorganized U.S. territory located 2,300 miles southwest of Hawaii. It comprises seven islands in the South Pacific, and has a total area of 76 square miles and a population of about 35,000. The territory of American Samoa has been voluntarily associated with the United States since 1899. The United States acquired six of the islands through agreements with indigenous leaders during the early 1900's and the seventh in 1925.

The C-24 adopted the conclusions and recommendations of its Subcommittee on Small Territories concerning American Samoa, and decided to submit a draft resolution to the General Assembly. Among other things, the draft reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of American Samoa to self-determination and independence, and called on the United States to take all necessary steps to expedite the process of decolonization in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the Declaration. The resolution also noted the importance of fostering an awareness among the people of American Samoa of the possibilities open to them in exercising their right to self-determination and independence, and called on the United States to strengthen and diversify the economy of the Territory.

Guam

Guam is an organized, unincorporated U.S. territory. It was ceded to the United States by Spain in 1898 at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War. About 30 miles long and 4-8 miles wide, Guam is the southernmost island in the volcanic Mariana Islands chain in the western Pacific, about 6,000 miles west of San Francisco, and has a population of approximately 115,000.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The resolution *inter alia* reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Guam to

self-determination and independence and noted the C-24's strong conviction that military bases and installations in Guam could constitute an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration. It urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures not to involve the territory in any offensive acts or interference against any other States and to comply fully with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the Declaration, and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities. It also urged the United States to strengthen and diversify Guam's economy, help Guam to remove constraints to growth in the areas of agriculture and commercial fishing, and safeguard the right of the Guamanians to the natural resources of the territory, including marine resources within its exclusive economic zone.

U.S. Virgin Islands

The U.S. Virgin Islands, also an organized and unincorporated U.S. territory, were purchased from Denmark in 1917. The most prominent of these islands located 1,000 miles southeast of Miami are St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John. The population of the territory is about 110,000, and total land area is approximately 130 square miles.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The draft resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands to self-determination and independence, reiterated the responsibility of the United States to create conditions that aid the people of the islands in exercising these rights, and urged the United States to take measures to diversify and expand the territory's infrastructure, and promote economic and social development. The draft also urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures to comply with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the Declaration, and General Assembly resolutions that relate to the military activities of administering powers and their territories.

General Assembly Action

American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were considered, along with a number of other smaller territories, in 16 meetings of the Fourth Committee between September 24 and November 24 under the agenda item "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

On October 16, Ambassador Byrne addressed the Committee, pointing out that the people of American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have affirmed and reaffirmed in election after election their strong desire to exercise self-determination while maintaining a close relationship with the United States. She noted that the United States has no military bases or troops stationed in American Samoa or the U.S. Virgin Islands and stressed the untruthfulness of allegations that the presence of military facilities and personnel in Guam was a major impediment to Guam's self-determination.

On October 22 the Fourth Committee adopted the resolutions on American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands without a vote. The plenary adopted these three resolutions without a vote on October 31.

The Fourth Committee decided in October not to include the resolution on Puerto Rico on its agenda. However, it was mentioned in the C-24 report adopted in the Committee and subsequently by the plenary.

NAMIBIA

Security Council Consideration

During 1986, the United States continued its efforts to bring independence to Namibia based on UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 435. These efforts were frustrated by the continued unwillingness of the Angolan Government to reopen the dialogue with Washington that the Angolans suspended in 1985.

The Security Council itself held no formal meetings on Namibia in 1986. On August 26, Namibia Day, the Council President did issue a consensus statement underscoring UNSC commitment to "discharging its responsibility to the people of Namibia," reviewing UNSC actions to that end and recalling that linkage of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola to implementation of Security Council Resolution 435 had been rejected by Council. (Note: The United States considers that all parties to the Namibia problem have, explicitly or implicitly, agreed that Cuban troop withdrawal is a factor that must be taken into consideration in the context of independence for Namibia.)

General Assembly Consideration

In 1986 the General Assembly considered Namibia at nine regular sessions, a special session, and an international conference. At the regular sessions, November 12–14, a total of 87 delegations took part in the debate, including the United States, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the League of Arab States, and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Most speakers condemned the South African occupation of Namibia and exploitation of its resources, rejected the linking of Cuban troop withdrawal (CTW) from Angola with independence for Namibia, condemned U.S. support for UNITA and called for mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. All speakers agreed on the need to move Namibia promptly toward independence in accordance with the UN plan set out in Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). That plan calls for a cease-fire in Namibia, followed by free and fair elections to be supervised by a UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), and for a Namibian constituent assembly that would draft an independence constitution.

Recognition of SWAPO as the "sole and authentic representative" of the Namibian people, calls for military support for SWAPO, and assertions of the "legitimacy of the armed struggle— notions rejected by the United States—were also voiced during the debate and figured in the language of the resolutions."

On November 20 the General Assembly met to vote on the five resolutions proposed by the Council for Namibia. The United States and many other nations consider the Council biased in its approach to the problem of Namibia; only 4 Western States figure among its 31 members. Prior to voting on the resolutions as a whole, the President of the General Assembly announced that several delegations had requested separate votes on particular paragraphs that contained "name-calling" language singling out specific countries for selective critical references, contrary to standard UN practice and tradition. Deletion of this language was a prime objective of the United States at the 41st UNGA. 2 of the 5 resolutions contained a total of 10 perjorative references to the United States and 1 critical of Israel. Because the subject of Namibia is considered to be an "important question" under the terms of the UN Charter, proponents of retaining name-calling references required a two-thirds majority. In all 11 cases, the United States easily surpassed the blocking one-third-plus-one vote. Support for the United States on the separate name-calling

votes was strongest when the language under consideration "strongly condemned" or "rejected" a policy, position, or supposed activity of the United States Support was weakest when the language in question only "appealed" or "called for" the United States to alter its position.

With the separate voting completed, the General Assembly turned to the resolutions as a whole. All five resolutions were adopted with no negative votes, but with several abstentions. Because of their ongoing role, the United States and the other members of the Contact Group (Canada, France, the United Kingdom, and West Germany) abstained on all the Namibia resolutions. The United States had informed other Contact Group members that it planned to vote against any resolution in which hostile references to the United States were not deleted. (Note: The Contact Group was formed in 1977 to lead an effort for Namibian independence under Security Council resolution 435.)

The first resolution was entitled "Situation in Namibia Resulting in the Illegal Occupation of the Territory by South Africa." It was adopted by a vote of 130 to 0, with 26 (U.S.) abstentions. The resolution declared that " . . . South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its defiance . . . of the United Nations, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, its acts of destabilization and aggression against independent African states, and its policies of apartheid constitute a threat to international peace and security." The resolution further rejected "constructive engagement and linkage" and "strongly" urged the Security Council . . . "to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against [South Africa] as provided for in Chapter VII of the UN Charter." Finally the resolution condemned "the activities of all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia that are illegally exploiting the resources of the Territory." The draft resolution contained eight references critical of the United States and one critical of Israel. The vote on these nine instances were as follows:

PREAMBULAR PARA 11, LINE 23: (criticizes refusal by United States to impose sanctions on South Africa because of Namibia): 53-46 (U.S.)-44

PREAMBULAR PARA 11, LINE 27: (criticizes alleged American involvement in Angolan internal affairs): 57-46 (U.S.)-40

PREAMBULAR PARA 21, LINE 3 (accuses the United States of supporting UNITA): 53-47 (U.S.)-44

OPERATIVE PARA 25, LINE 1 (calls on the United States to desist from linkage): 69-49 (U.S.)-30

OPERATIVE PARA 26, LINE 2 (attacks constructive engagement and linkage pursued by the present United States Administration): 56-51 (U.S.)-40

OPERATIVE PARA 27, LINE 2 (underscores rejection of linkage "advanced by the United States "): 56-52 (U.S.)-39

OPERATIVE PARA 28, LINE 6 (appeals to the United States to desist from constructive engagement): 64-51 (U.S.)-32

OPERATIVE PARA 42, LINE 1 (urges the United States to refrain from imposing its veto in the Security Council): 74-43 (U.S.)-29

OPERATIVE PARA 49, LINE 2 (criticizing Israeli policies towards South Africa requested by Israelis): 80-47 (U.S.)-22 (Resolution 41/39A)

The second resolution, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)" was adopted by a vote of 133 to 0, with 25 (U.S.) abstentions. The resolution reiterates that Security Council Resolutions 385 and 435 constitute "the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia" and "demands that South Africa urgently comply fully and unconditionally" with these resolutions. It reaffirms the "inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom, self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia." It recalls that "the 'linkage' insisted upon by South Africa of the independence of Namibia with totally irrelevant and extraneous issues, such as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, has been rejected by the General Assembly and the Security Council and has been condemned world-wide." The resolution included two critical references to the United States by name, as well as a pejorative reference to the "two Western permanent members" of the Security Council for preventing effective measures (against South Africa) under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. (The United States took no action to have this pejorative reference deleted.) The two critical references were rejected by the following margins:

OPERATIVE PARA 9, LINE 1-2 (condemns the United States for linkage): 51-50 (U.S.)-40

OPERATIVE PARA 10, LINE 2 (condemns "two western members" of the Security Council for "misuse" of the veto): 54-52 (U.S.)-38
(Resolution 41/39 B)

A third resolution, entitled "Program of Work of the United Nations Council for Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 151 to 0, with 7 (U.S.) abstentions. Neither it nor the last two resolutions contained any hostile name-calling. The resolution approved the report of the UN Council for Namibia, including the recommendations therein, and decided to make "adequate financial provision" for these recommendations. The resolution also requested all states to cooperate with the Council for Namibia and decided that Namibia, represented by the Council, should participate as a full member in all conferences and meetings organized by the United Nations. The resolution also set out a variety of tasks and pro-

grams for the Council for Namibia to undertake. (Resolution 41/39 C)

A fourth resolution, entitled "Dissemination of Information and Mobilization of International Public Opinion in Support of the Immediate Independence of Namibia," passed by a vote of 135 to 0, with 23 (U.S.) abstentions. It outlines a broad program designed to advance public awareness "on all aspects of Namibia as an instrument for furthering the mandate given by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia." It also called on nongovernmental organizations "to increase the awareness of their national communities and legislative bodies concerning South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia." (Resolution 41/39 D)

The fifth and final resolution entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia," was adopted by a vote 152 to 0, with six (U.S.) abstentions. The resolution stated that the UN Fund for Namibia, including the trust funds for the Nationhood Program for Namibia and the UN Institute for Namibia (UNIN), should be the primary source of assistance to Namibians. The resolution allocated \$1.5 million from the 1987 regular UN budget to the UN Fund for Namibia. It also requested the UN Commissioner for Namibia, "... to formulate, in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization, projects of assistance to the Namibian people." Finally, the resolution commended UNIN "for the effectiveness of its training programs for Namibians and urged other UN institutions to cooperate closely with it." (Resolution 41/39 E)

In her explanation of the U.S. vote, Ambassador Patricia Byrne reaffirmed that the only basis for a just and peaceful settlement in Namibia remains Security Council Resolution 435. She regretted, however, that since the suspension of diplomatic efforts associated with the implementation of 435, the war has intensified and peace has been forced to a seat on the sidelines. Ambassador Byrne attributed responsibility for the lack of progress directly to the government in Luanda, rejected criticism of the United States for allegedly linking Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola to implementation of Resolution 435 and underscored the U.S. conviction that there could be no military victory for either the government or UNITA, its armed opponent. Ambassador Byrne rejected mandatory sanctions against South Africa, expressed U.S. opposition to support for the "armed struggle" (i.e. SWAPO) in Namibia and pointed out that declaring SWAPO "the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people" was inadmissible in that it purported to speak for all Namibians.

In a related development, the General Assembly elected by consensus on December 11, Bernd Carlsson (Sweden) to replace

the Indian Brajesh Misha (India) as the UN Commissioner for Namibia. Carlsson assumed office on July 1st of 1987.

In Vienna on July 7-11, pursuant to a resolution passed at the 41st UNGA, General Assembly members—under the auspices of the Council for Namibia—held an International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia. Members of the Contact Group attended in the capacity of unofficial observers only. The resultant program of action and declaration were harshly critical of U.S. policy on Namibia.

On September 17-20 the General Assembly, again pursuant to a resolution adopted at the 40th UNGA, held a Special Session on Namibia in New York. While the final resolution passed 126 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions (Resolution 5-14/A, B), the United States succeeded via procedural moves in having two instances of hostile name-calling removed. An effort mounted by Zambia to deny the United States right to a separate vote was defeated by 62, (U.S.) to 55 with 20 abstentions. As Namibia is considered an important question, the United States needed only a blocking third to succeed on the subsequent votes. The language calling on “the United States Administration . . . to desist from linkage” was deleted after a vote of 65 to 48 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. The language rejecting “linkage and constructive engagement pursued by the United States Administration” was also deleted by a vote of 60 to 48 (U.S.), with 30 abstentions.

During the debate, a total of 88 delegations spoke, including 27 foreign ministers. Nearly all were harshly critical of South Africa for “impeding” Namibian independence. In his explanation of vote, Ambassador Walters made the same points as those to be later reiterated by Ambassador Byrne during the regular General Assembly debate. He rejected “all accusations that hold the United States responsible for a lack of progress” in implementing UN Security Council Resolution 435 and stressed that the Angolans themselves, in their November 1984 letter to the Secretary General, had “implicitly accepted the principle that Namibian independence could only be achieved in the context of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.”

Puerto Rico

As it has done for several years, Cuba sponsored (with the assistance of Venezuela) a resolution in the Committee of 24 “reaffirming” Puerto Rico’s right to independence. Puerto Ricans have repeatedly declined to exercise this option. Although the commit-

tee adopted the resolution (10-1-8; five were absent or did not vote), the Fourth Committee, as it traditionally does, decided not to pass the issue on to the plenary, since the item does not appear on the UNGA agenda. The UNGA voted overwhelmingly in 1982 against a move to inscribe Puerto Rico on its agenda.

The United States opposes discussion of Puerto Rico in this committee because of the UN Charter and General Assembly Resolution 748 (1953) which removed Puerto Rico from the list of non-self-governing territories, following the Puerto Rican people's decision to become a U.S. commonwealth. The General Assembly action recognized that Puerto Ricans had exercised their right to self-determination, and that, as a self-governing entity, Puerto Rico was no longer a proper subject for UN consideration under the UN Charter.

WESTERN SAHARA

The conflict in Western Sahara dates from 1975. When Spain transferred administrative control of the territory to Morocco and Mauritania, the POLISARIO Front launched a guerrilla war against Mauritania and Morocco to obtain independence for the entire territory. Mauritania withdrew from the territory in 1979. Morocco then extended its territorial claims to include the one-third of the Sahara formerly claimed (and ultimately renounced) by Mauritania, and the guerrilla war between the POLISARIO Front and Morocco continued. The U.S. position has been to support a negotiated settlement acceptable to the parties directly concerned under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations.

At the 41st Session the Western Sahara issue was raised initially in the Fourth Committee where, unlike previous years, only Algeria introduced a resolution (instead of both Algeria and Morocco). The essential elements of the Algerian resolution included a description of the two parties to the conflict as Morocco and the POLISARIO, support for a referendum for self-determination of the Western Sahara under the auspices of the United Nations and the OAU, an appeal to Morocco and the POLISARIO to implement UNGA resolution 40/50, and an invitation to the Secretary-General to continue his good offices. Morocco holds Algeria responsible for supporting the POLISARIO militarily and politically and maintains that the real second party to the dispute is Algeria itself, not the POLISARIO. Otherwise, Morocco supports the Secretary-General's efforts as well as the concept of a referendum under certain conditions.

During his explanation of vote in the Fourth Committee, Ambassador Walters regretted that while the spirit of compromise appeared to be making some headway under the aegis of the Secretary-General, such was not reflected in the resolution. He recalled that the United States, as in past years, had very much hoped for a consensus resolution acceptable to both Algeria and Morocco, underscoring that only through working towards such a resolution would the Fourth Committee be well placed to contribute to a solution. Ambassador Walters noted that the resolution under discussion was “heavily biased,” in favor of the Algerian position and that the United States would abstain “with reluctance.” He called for a solution that takes into account “the preferences of the people directly affected.” The Algerian resolution passed in the Fourth Committee, on October 22, by a vote of 92 to 2, with 46 (U.S.) abstentions.

Consideration of the item on the Western Sahara was taken up in the General Assembly plenary on October 31, where the identical resolution to that voted on in the Fourth Committee passed by a vote of 98 to 0 with 44 (US) abstentions. (Resolution 41/16)

NEW CALEDONIA

On December 1 and 2, the General Assembly considered a resolution drafted by the South Pacific Forum States to reinscribe New Caledonia on the list of non-self-governing territories. New Caledonia is a French overseas territory located in the Pacific Ocean and has a population of about 150,000. It was acquired by France in 1853. New Caledonia was inscribed on the original list of non-self-governing territories in 1946 following the transmission by the French Government of information on the territory pursuant to Article 73(e) of the UN Charter. Beginning in 1947, however, France declined to provide further information to the United Nations regarding New Caledonia.

Supporters of the resolution sought reinscription of New Caledonia on the list of non-self-governing territories in order that the Committee of 24 would be able at its 1987 session to review developments in the territory, including its future constitutional development. Given the presence of a pro-independence movement in New Caledonia, and asserting that the current French Government had stepped back from commitments of the previous French Administration on the question of independence for the territory, supporters viewed reinscription as assisting progress in New Caledonia toward the exercise of self-determination in cooperation with the United Nations. Introducing the draft resolution,

the Fijian Representative stated: "The draft resolution is straightforward with a very simple purpose. It asks the General Assembly to apply to the Non-Self-Governing Territory of New Caledonia the normal and well-established UN decolonization procedures." The French Representative opposed the resolution, stating that New Caledonia could not be considered a non-self-governing territory since it was fully integrated with France and enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. Furthermore, a referendum would be held in New Caledonia by the summer of 1987 providing voters with a choice between independence and increased autonomy.

Sponsored by 31 states, including the UN members of the South Pacific Forum (Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu), the resolution declared that New Caledonia was a non-self-governing territory for which France had the obligation to provide information to the UN Secretary-General under Chapter XI of the Charter, affirmed the right of the people of New Caledonia to self-determination and independence, requested the C-24 examine the question of New Caledonia at its next session and report to the 42d session of the UNGA, and requested France to cooperate with the C-24. The resolution (41/41 A) was adopted by a vote of 89-24-34 (U.S.) on December 2. The United States abstained on this resolution because a number of its close allies and friends either strongly supported or strongly opposed the resolution. Therefore, the United States believed that its support for a peaceful settlement of the future political status of New Caledonia required it not to take sides on the resolution.

OTHER QUESTIONS

Fourth Committee Resolutions

In several sessions beginning on September 29, the Fourth Committee considered the agenda item "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid, and racial discrimination in southern Africa." Speaking on October 7, Ambassador Byrne rebutted the allegation that multinational corporations impede political self-determination and economic well-being. She stated that multinational corporations provided the financial and human resources needed for non-self-governing territories, pointing out that the people in Ameri-

can territories recognized the benefits they received from multinational corporations. On the same day, the Committee approved a resolution on "foreign economic activities" by a vote of 91 to 9 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. It concurrently approved a decision on "military activities and arrangements by colonial powers in territories" by a vote of 89 to 13 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions.

On October 22, a resolution on reporting information from non-self-governing territories was adopted by a vote of 143 to 0, with three abstentions (U.S.). A resolution dealing with the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 122 to 4 (U.S.) with 24 abstentions after an Israeli motion supported by the United States to delete name-calling from the resolution failed to pass. Resolutions and decisions dealing with 12 small territories, including American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well with the UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa, and with offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of non-self-governing territories were passed without a vote. A resolution on St. Helena was adopted by a vote of 108 to 2 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions after the United Kingdom, supported by the United States and others, failed to have a reference to military facilities on Ascension Island deleted from the resolution.

Plenary Action

Plenary debate on decolonization, including reports of the C-24 and the Fourth Committee took place on October 31 and December 1-2. On October 31 the resolution on "foreign economic activities" was approved by a vote of 125 to 11 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions (Resolution 41/14) and the declaration on "military activities" by a margin of 124 to 13 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Decision 41/405) The resolution reporting information from non-self-governing territories was adopted by a vote of 149 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 41/13) The resolution on the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 123 to 4 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. (Resolution 41/15) The plenary adopted without a vote the same 14 draft resolutions and decisions which the Fourth Committee had earlier adopted without a vote. The resolution on St. Helena was passed by a vote of 125 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 26 abstentions. (Decision 41/408)

On December 2, the plenary adopted the omnibus resolution on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by a vote of 144 to 3 (U.S., U.K., and France), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 41/41 B) Also approved was a resolution on dissemination of information

on decolonialization by a margin of 148 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 41/42)

Part 4

Legal Developments

INTRODUCTION

Significant legal issues on both substantive and procedural matters frequently arise in connection with U.S. participation in a wide variety of UN activities and in nearly all international organizations. Many of these legal matters are discussed in other parts of this report in the context of the underlying issues or particular international organizations to which they relate, including review of the UN Charter; uses of outer space; international human rights; International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and UNESCO matters; UN administration and budget; and UN trusteeship issues. Part 4, therefore, deals separately with 1986 activities of an exclusively legal character, such as those of the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission, the UN Commission on International Trade Law, the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and special international conferences or committees that consider legal questions involving the drafting of certain treaties or the relations between the United States as the host country on the one hand and the United Nations and missions to the United Nations on the other. As indicated above, drafting exercises concerning international human rights instruments are discussed in Part 2 of this report.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court's main functions are to decide cases submitted to it by states and to give advisory opinions on legal questions at the request of intergovernmental bodies authorized pursuant to the Statute of the Court and the UN Charter.

The Court is composed of 15 judges, no 2 of whom may be nationals of the same state, elected by the UN General Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently, from a list of persons nominated by national groups on the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The electors are mandated to bear in mind the qualifications of the individual candidates and the need for the Court as a whole to represent the main forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world. Court members are elected for 9-year terms, with one-third of the total number of judges elected every 3 years.

The Court submitted to the 41st General Assembly a brief report on its activities from August 1, 1985, to July 31, 1986. The report contained information on the Court's composition, jurisdiction, judicial work, administration, and publications. The General Assembly took note of the report on November 3. (Decision 41/111)

Nicaragua v. United States of America

In June 27, 1986, the Court rendered its decision against the United States. The United States continued to maintain that the Court's decision that it had jurisdiction in the case was "clearly and manifestly erroneous as to both fact and law" and that the Court was without jurisdiction to entertain the dispute. In this light the United States has not accepted Nicaragua's proposal to discuss reparations.

Nicaragua has twice unsuccessfully attempted to obtain a Security Council resolution urging U.S. observance of the decision.

INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION

Pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 174 (II) of November 21, 1947, the International Law Commission (ILC) was established in 1948 to promote the codification and progressive development of international law. The membership, which was increased from 25 to 34 during the 36th General Assembly, consists of legal experts serving in their individual capacities and elected by the General Assembly for 5-year terms. Stephen Conolley McCaffrey of the United States was elected on November 23, 1982, for a term which began on January 1, 1982. The quinquennial election for members of the ILC was held in the General Assembly on November 14, 1986. Mr. McCaffrey was reelected.

The Commission studies topics it has determined are suitable for codification, or that other UN bodies, usually the General Assembly, refer to it. Its normal procedure is to select one of its members (designated a "special rapporteur") to prepare reports on each of the topics and, after discussion, to draft articles which are acted on by the full Commission. Each year, the Commission reports to the General Assembly on the articles it has adopted during that year's session. It reconsiders the articles in light of government comments, and then adopts final texts which it forwards to the General Assembly. When the Assembly receives a set of draft articles, generally in the form of a proposed convention, it may convene a diplomatic conference to consider adoption of a convention, review the articles itself, note them, or remand them to the Commission for further study.

Work of the Commission's 38th Session

The ILC held its 38th session in Geneva from May 5 to July 11, 1986. It elected Mr. Doudou Thiam of Senegal as its Chairman.

The Commission considered seven substantive topics: jurisdictional immunities of States and their property, status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier, State responsibility, the Draft Code of Offenses against the Peace and Security of Mankind, international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law, non-navigational uses of international watercourses, and relations between States and international organizations.

The Commission adopted provisionally as a whole on first reading draft articles on jurisdictional immunities of States and their property, a topic that had been under consideration by the ILC since 1978, and transmitted the draft articles through the Secretary-General to governments for comments to be submitted by January 1, 1988.

Similarly, the Commission adopted provisionally as a whole on first reading and transmitted for comment due January 1, 1988, draft articles on the status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier. This topic had been before the Commission since 1977.

Because of the time devoted to the jurisdictional immunities and diplomatic courier and bag items at the 1986 Session, the ILC was not able to undertake extensive work on the remaining five items on its agenda, though all were considered to varying extents.

General Assembly Action

The Sixth Committee of the 41st General Assembly considered the Commission's report at 18 meetings from October 29 to November 24. On November 24 Brazil introduced a draft resolution on behalf of 50 cosponsors. The draft concerned the Commission's report, and *inter alia* recommended the Commission should continue its work on all the topics in its current program; reaffirmed its previous decisions concerning the increased role of the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat; and confirmed that the ILC should maintain the usual duration of its session. The draft was approved by the Committee on November 24 and by the plenary Assembly on December 3, in both instances by consensus. (Resolution 41/81)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

The UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), established by the General Assembly in 1966, continued at its 19th Session and in the meetings of its working groups to do serious and professional legal work to unify and harmonize the law of international trade. The Commission is composed of 36 Member States elected by the General Assembly for a term of 6 years.*

Work of the Commission's 19th Session

The 1986 session of UNCITRAL took place in New York on June 23 to July 11, 1986. The United States was represented by Peter H. Pfund, Assistant Legal Adviser for Private International Law, Department of State; Professor John A. Spanogle, Jr., Faculty of Law at the State University of New York at Buffalo; Professor E. Allan Farnsworth, Columbia Law School; Professor Carl Felsenfeld, Fordham University School of Law; Professor Joseph C. Sweeney, Fordham University School of Law; and Robert B. Rosenstock, Legal Adviser, U.S. Mission to the UN.

The Commission devoted most of its time to review of the draft convention on international bills of exchange and international promissory notes. The Commission had devoted 13 meetings

*Members in 1986 were Algeria, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Central African Republic, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia.

of its Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments and most of 2 prior sessions of the Commission itself to this project, and the hope was that the Commission would complete its work on this project and be able to transmit the draft Convention to the General Assembly after the 19th Session of UNCITRAL. However, comments and proposals by some countries on the draft convention and their discussion at the session required more time than anticipated. Moreover, it became clear to delegates from many countries that a UN-convoked diplomatic conference of 2-3 weeks for the adoption of the final text that would cost \$2-3 million would involve an expense that the United Nations would be unlikely to be able to incur in the near future, given its current financial difficulties. The alternative seemed to be UNCITRAL fine-tuning of the draft convention to the point that the General Assembly could approve it and open it for signature and ratification or accession by States without a diplomatic conference. The higher degree of final polishing of the draft convention required for the second alternative, in addition to discussion of the new proposals made by some governments and the reduction of the length of the 19th Session by 1 week for budgetary reasons, made completion of the work impossible during the session. It was therefore decided to convoke a 14th meeting of the UNCITRAL Working Group in January 1987 and have the Commission give the draft its final review at its 20th session in 1987, after which the draft convention would be sent to the General Assembly for further action.

The Commission authorized the Secretariat to publish the legal guide on electronic funds transfers prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with its Study Group on International Payments. It also agreed to undertake work on the formulation of model legal rules on electronic funds transfers, beginning that work by considering the legal issues identified in the last chapter of the legal guide on electronic funds transfers.

The Commission noted that another of its working groups would be completing review of the revised legal guide on the drawing up of international contracts for the construction of industrial works at a final session on this project, and decided that the Commission would consider the final draft of this legal guide at its 20th Session in 1987. It was decided that its next priority project would be a legal guide on international procurement. In addition, the Secretariat is to prepare preliminary studies on the subjects of countertrade and joint ventures with a view to a future decision by the Commission on the priority to be given to those subjects.

The Commission noted the progress being made by its third working group on the preparation of uniform rules on the topic of liability of operators of transport terminals.

The Commission took note with appreciation of the comprehensive report of its Secretariat on the current activities of international organizations related to the harmonization and unification of international trade law—an update of an earlier version of such a report submitted to the Commission at its 16th Session.

Having considered at its 18th Session a report of the Secretariat on the legal value of computer records, the Commission at its 19th Session considered a report on the legal aspects of automatic data processing first describing the work of international organizations active in this field and then analyzing the work undertaken by subject matter covered. The report concluded that despite considerable coordination and consultation a further degree of coordination was desirable. The Commission generally approved of the proposal contained in the report that the Commission Secretariat organize a meeting of representatives of all interested international organizations for the purpose of improving coordination of work in this area.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTION

The Sixth Committee of the 41st General Assembly considered the report of UNCITRAL at six meetings on September 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 and November 5. As in the past, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Rosenstock, expressed support for the proposed future work of the Commission and the satisfaction of the United States at the quality of the work of the UNCITRAL Secretariat.

On November 5 Austria introduced a draft General Assembly resolution in the Sixth Committee, eventually sponsored by a number of other countries, *inter alia* noting the progress made on the preparation of the draft convention on international bills of exchange and international promissory notes and noting in this connection the need to minimize the financial costs of adopting the convention without sacrificing its quality or international acceptability. The draft resolution requested the Commission to complete its work on the convention at its 20th Session, and provided for a decision of the 41st UN General Assembly to consider the draft convention at its 42d Session. The resolution noted the progress made on the legal guide on the drawing up of international contracts for the construction of industrial works and welcomed the Commission's decision to commence work on international procurement as a matter of priority. It noted the completion of the legal guide on electronic funds transfers, the decision

to publish it as a product of the work of the Secretariat, and the decision to undertake work on the formulation of model legal rules on electronic funds transfers.

The draft resolution was approved in Committee, and the General Assembly on December 3 adopted the resolution without a vote. (Resolution 41/77)

DRAFT CODE OF OFFENSES AGAINST THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF MANKIND

The General Assembly has been considering this item on and off since 1947 without definitive result. The original impetus for the exercise was an inclination, building on the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, to draft highly detailed rules, violation of which would constitute criminal behavior. Initial efforts resulted in a draft by the International Law Commission which did not command sufficient support for final action to be taken. After a hiatus of 20 years, during which the Assembly dealt in other forms with much of the conduct in question, resulting in such instruments as the Genocide Convention and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance With the Charter of the United Nations, the Assembly resumed consideration of the item at its 33d Session in 1978.

In the course of the Assembly's consideration of the item in 1978, and from 1980-85 and in written comments, the United States along with most of the Western European countries welcomed the decision of the International Law Commission to limit its consideration at this stage to responsibility of individuals rather than States but expressed great doubt that any useful progress could be made, since, *inter alia*, the project exceeded the clear basis of universal agreement and the issues involved are inextricably linked to the mechanism of international criminal jurisdiction on which progress is most unlikely. Western countries also noted the extent to which much of the original material had in fact been dealt with elsewhere in the interim. Support for the item from some non-aligned countries and the Soviet Union has, however, been sufficient to keep it before the United Nations.

The Sixth Committee considered the item at meetings between October 29 and November 13. On November 12, a draft resolution was introduced by Egypt cosponsored by 26 other countries which, *inter alia*, invited the International Law Commission to continue its work with a view to elaborating the Draft Code and decided to include an item in the 42d provisional agenda enti-

tled "Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind." The United States joined France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, and the United Kingdom in voting against this resolution on the ground that this item should be considered along with the other work of the International Law Commission.

The resolution was approved by the Sixth Committee by a vote of 102 to 5 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 3 by a vote of 141 to 5 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 41/75)

NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Special Committee

The Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations held its ninth session in New York, January 20–February 14. The Non-Use of Force (NUF) Committee, which operates by consensus, devoted 4 meetings to a general debate in which 14 members and 3 observers participated. Statements during the general debate continued to reflect the three distinct views which have come to characterize the Committee's work. One view supported the Soviet proposal to draft a world treaty on the non-use of force. The second, espoused by many of the non-aligned countries, supported a declaration of principles on the non-use of force. The third, backed principally by members of the Western group, including the United States, opposed a treaty or other form of norm-creating instrument and suggested the Committee study why states resort to force and how methods of peaceful settlement of disputes could be strengthened.

Addressing the Committee on January 23, the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, said the U.S. attitude toward the Committee or the issues before it remained unchanged from last year. He said that until the Committee found common ground, it could not hope to achieve any progress. The United States continued to believe that neither a treaty nor any other instrument focused on the content of the norm would contribute to enhancing the effectiveness of the prohibition on the threat or use of force. The norm could not be considered in isolation from the collective security system of which it is a part. Focusing on ways and means to make the collective security system function better, he said, is the route to a useful contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of the norm.

The Committee reestablished a working group in which members could consider specific proposals. The working group held 13 meetings between January 28 and February 13. The Committee

devoted two of these meetings to an evaluation of the work done by the working group. On February 13 the Committee considered and approved the report of the working group and adopted its own report to the General Assembly.

General Assembly

The Sixth Committee considered the report of the Non-Use of Force (NUF) Committee at six meetings between October 6-10 and one meeting on November 14.

On October 10 the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, told the Sixth Committee that any drafting exercise must concentrate on the ways to enhance the effectiveness of the norm against the use of force, not on the content of the norm itself. A declaration on non-use of force would be useful only if it focused on the correlative obligations under Article 2 (3) of the UN Charter to settle disputes peacefully and affirmed the need to promote respect for human rights and practical measures to strengthen the collective security system.

On November 14 the Sixth Committee approved without a vote a draft resolution sponsored by Hungary and 38 other States. This draft resolution asked that the NUF Committee complete a draft declaration on the enhancement of the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force.

On December 3 the General Assembly adopted the same text without a vote. (Resolution 41/76)

PROTECTION OF DIPLOMATS

The Sixth Committee considered protection of diplomats at four meetings on November 18-20 and November 26.

On November 14 Norway, on behalf of 19 cosponsors, introduced a draft resolution condemning attacks on diplomats and asking the Secretary-General to prepare a report for the Committee's 42d Session giving information on the state of ratifications and accessions to treaties relevant to the safety of diplomats and on any incidents endangering diplomats reported to him by States. The Committee approved the resolution by consensus on November 20, and it was adopted by the General Assembly by consensus on December 3. (Resolution 41/78)

On November 20 the Byelorussian S.S.R. delegate introduced a resolution commemorating the 25th Anniversary of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations on behalf of 19 cosponsors. This resolution was approved by the Committee unanimously on

that same date, and was adopted without a vote by the Assembly on December 3. (Resolution 41/79)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST MERCENARY ACTIVITIES

In Resolution 35/48, the General Assembly established an *Ad Hoc* ommittee on the Drafting of an International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing, and Training of Mercenaries. The *Ad Hoc* Committee was to be composed of 35 Member States but currently consists of 34.* At its first session in 1981, the Committee discussed the various issues that must be resolved before an international convention against mercenary activities can be concluded.

During its 1982 session, the Committee had before it draft conventions prepared by Nigeria and France, comments from several Member States, and a compilation of international agreements and national legislation relating to mercenary activities. In addition to discussing the draft articles of the Nigerian and French texts and related proposals from other Member States, the Committee formed two working groups that used most of the time allocated to the Committee for its 1982 Session. Working Group A dealt with issues of definition and the scope of the future convention, and Working Group B addressed all other issues relevant to it. Both Working Groups succeeded in clarifying, and thus simplifying, a number of issues, although some critical ones such as the definition of the term "mercenary" were not resolved. This work was continued during the 1983, 1984, and 1985 sessions. No 1986 Session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee was held as a result of the UN financial situation.

The Sixth Committee considered the item in meetings on October 28 and November 17 and 18. On November 17 Nigeria introduced a resolution on behalf of 40 cosponsors renewing the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and inviting it to meet for 4 weeks early in 1987 to continue its work. The resolution was later amended from the floor by Nigeria to call for a 3-week session. The resolution, as amended, was approved by the Sixth Committee on November 18 without a vote. The U.S. Representative, Ms.

*Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Seychelles, Spain, Suriname, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia.

Carolyn Willson, stated that had a vote been taken, the United States would have abstained *inter alia* because it did not agree with the sixth preambular paragraph, which states that mercenary activities are contrary to fundamental principles of international law. The Assembly adopted the resolution on December 3 without a vote. (Resolution 41/80)

Strengthening International Security

In 1969 the Soviet Union proposed an agenda item for the General Assembly on the "Strengthening of International Security." The Assembly adopted a Soviet-sponsored declaration on this topic in 1970 which touched on the full range of UN activity, including peaceful settlement of disputes, strengthening peacekeeping procedures, disarmament, colonialism, racial discrimination, self-determination, and closing the economic gap between developed and developing countries. Resolutions calling for implementation of this declaration have been considered annually by the General Assembly since 1971. Although the United States voted in favor of the initial declaration, it has often abstained or voted against subsequent resolutions under this agenda item on the grounds that they contribute little to promoting peace and respect for the principles of the UN Charter. Moreover, some of these resolutions on strengthening international security have contained formulations unacceptable to the United States.

In recent years the non-aligned countries have used this agenda item as a vehicle to promote cardinal tenets of nonaligned doctrine such as anticolonialism, the New International Economic Order, support for national liberation movements, and national sovereignty over natural resources. Four draft resolutions were introduced and considered by the First Committee during the period November 20-26 under the agenda item, "Strengthening International Security" (SIS).

On November 26, by a vote of 96 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions, the Committee adopted Yugoslavia's traditional resolution entitled, "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security." The text contained the full roster of nonaligned dogma ranging from halting the arms race to the nuclear capability of South Africa. *Inter alia* the resolution noted with concern that the provisions of the SIS declaration had not been fully implemented and urged all states to abide strictly by their obligations under the UN Charter. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 4 by a vote of 126 to 1 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions. (Resolution 41/90)

In the past, the United States had abstained on this resolution. At the 41st Assembly, however, the United States judged that it was compelled to oppose the increasingly objectionable language which has come to dominate the text and therefore voted against the resolution. In explaining the negative U.S. vote, the U.S. Representative observed:

The United States has become increasingly concerned at the growing intrusion of rhetoric into the texts of the annual resolutions on this agenda item. Although the United States originally supported the 1970 UNGA Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the continuing references in the annual resolutions on this topic to extraneous and contentious matters and the repetition of viewpoints which the United States finds objectionable have caused us to reexamine our position on L.91.

The United States opposes the following specific elements in the text of L.91:

- The assertion that the superpowers are primarily responsible for a deteriorating international security climate. This ignores numerous other sources of conflict that have produced tremendous suffering in recent decades.

- The assertion that an extension of a nuclear arms race into outer space is occurring.

- The linking of disarmament and development. The United States has already made clear that it sees no inherent connection between these two topics.

- The assertion that the United Nations is an indispensable forum for bilateral negotiations. Since the United Nations is a deliberative body, it cannot truly be argued that it is an appropriate forum for conducting negotiations.

My delegation also finds unacceptable the call for support of national liberation movements, reference to the need to establish a so-called new international economic order and the notion that international relations need to be democratized. The United States commends democracy to all as the best known form of self-government and would wish to see all Member States fully apply its precepts. However, we recognize and fully respect the principle of sovereign equality in international relations.

Malta introduced its traditional SIS resolution on the "Strengthening of Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean Region." The text expressed concern that persistent and increasing tensions in parts of the Mediterranean posed a threat to peace and reaffirmed that security in the region is closely linked with European security. The resolution emphasized the need to reduce tensions and called for just and viable solutions for existing problems and crises in the region in accordance with the UN Charter and "the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation and the right of peoples under colonial or foreign domination to self-determination and independence." It also urged all states to cooperate with Mediterranean states to reduce tensions and promote peace, security and cooperation in the region. As in previous years, the Maltese SIS resolution was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 26. The plenary likewise adopted it by consensus on December 4. (Resolution 41/89)

Also under the SIS agenda item, the German Democratic Republic on November 21 submitted a new resolution on the "Need for Result-Oriented Political Dialogue to Improve the International Situation." Noting with satisfaction the resumed dialogue between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union and expressing concern over the escalation of the arms race, the resolution called upon all states to conduct a political dialogue and negotiations in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter. It also appealed to the members of the Security Council, especially its permanent members, "to take appropriate and effective measures in carrying out their primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security" and encouraged the Secretary-General "to facilitate dialogue and cooperation" to settle conflicts.

The United States objected to several formulations in the text, which it considered to be extraneous to the subject, and voted against the resolution. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 26 by a vote of 91 to 1 (U.S.), with 28 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 4 by a vote of 117 to 1 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions. (Resolution 41/91)

The centerpiece of First Committee consideration of the Strengthening of International Security agenda item was the fourth SIS resolution, introduced by Hungary on behalf of a group of Eastern countries, which called for the "Establishment of a Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security" (CSIS). In the original formulation circulated by the UN Secretariat, the text called upon states "to focus their efforts on ensuring equal security for all and in all spheres of international relations, and to this end to make their contribution to the elaboration of a document containing basic principles for a comprehensive system of international security." However, in the text ultimately presented to the First Committee on November 18, the operative paragraph of the CSIS resolution omitted reference to a document and merely called upon States "to make their contribution to working out the basic ideas for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security and provide guidance for the practical work to this end."

Many Western and nonaligned States, concerned that this proposal could undermine or supplant the collective security provisions of the UN Charter, engaged in intensive consultations with the resolution's sponsors. As a result, the text was extensively amended. As finally adopted by the Committee on November 26 by a vote of 82 to 2 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions, the resolution reaffirmed the collective security system enshrined in the Charter

and the need to adhere strictly to the fundamental principles of the Charter. The text's main operative paragraph called upon Member States "to make their contribution to practical measures to ensure compliance with and implementation of the Charter with particular regard to the crucial and interrelated areas of disarmament, crises and conflict settlement, economic development and cooperation, (and) the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms." The resolution also called for the implementation of resolutions of the United Nations. The General Assembly adopted the CSIS resolution on December 4 by a vote of 102 to 2 (U.S.), with 46 abstentions. (Resolution 41/92)

Despite the extensive revisions in the text, the United States still objected to the overall thrust of the CSIS resolution and to several of its specific formulations. In explaining its negative vote in the First Committee, the U.S. Representative stated:

The United States believes that the Charter of the United Nations already provides the world community with a vital and an irreplaceable system of international peace and security, a system which has served the world well for the past four decades. It is simply not necessary for us all to elaborate a new document or establish another system which would duplicate, if it did not impede, the functioning of the Charter and the organs already established under it. Of course, these organs, which are all functioning vigorously today, might perform better still if all Member States complied fully with their obligations under the Charter.

... The cosponsors have provided inadequate explanations of what they hope to achieve through L.89/Rev.1. They have spoken of their wish for dialogue, but they have been unable (or, perhaps, unwilling) to provide this Committee with a clear account of what they hope to achieve through their proposal. If the cosponsors of L.89 believe that there is something wrong with the functioning of the Charter, why have they not told us, in simple and direct terms, precisely what is wrong, and how they propose to remedy it?

Mr. Chairman, the United States cannot be a party to the adoption of draft resolution L.89/Rev.1, the implementation of which would inevitably undermine the principles enshrined in the UN Charter.

HOST COUNTRY RELATIONS

The General Assembly established the Committee on Relations with the Host Country* in 1971 to replace the informal Joint Committee on Host Country Relations. The Committee deals with the security of UN missions and safety of personnel, diplomatic privileges and immunities, tax problems, financial indebtedness of UN missions and their personnel, visa matters, and other

*The Committee's membership for 1986 was as follows: Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Honduras, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Senegal, Spain, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

issues relating to the implementation of the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States.**

The Committee met nine times during 1986: January 22, March 13, March 18, March 21, June 4, October 30 (twice), October 31, and November 18.

On December 3, 1986, the General Assembly adopted without a vote, resolution 41/82, which approved the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. The resolution endorsed the recommendations of the Committee contained in its report, strongly condemned criminal acts violating the security of missions accredited to the United Nations and the safety of their personnel, and urged the host country to take all necessary measures to prevent such acts. With respect to the request and action by the host country to reduce the size of certain missions, the resolution urged the host country and the Member States that raised the issues to follow the path of consultations with a view to reaching solutions to this matter.

On January 22 the Committee resumed consideration of the question of security of missions and the safety of their personnel. Reiterating his government's pride in being the host country to the United Nations, U.S. Representative Ambassador Joseph V. Reed stressed the role of the relevant U.S. authorities, in particular the New York City Police Department, in securing the safety of delegations during the 40th UNGA. He added the hope that rough spots in the implementation of new legislation relating to the United Nations would soon be overcome with the necessary patience and cooperation.

Also on January 22, the Committee considered the decision by the United States to impose regulations regarding travel within the United States of the members of the missions of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic and their dependents. The U.S. Representative defended the U.S. action, insisting that in adopting such regulations the United States simply wished those concerned to make travel arrangements through the relevant U.S. Government office. He said the U.S. Government was fully justified in imposing these regulations on the grounds of national security and denied they were either discriminatory or restrictive.

Finally, on January 22, the Chairman drew the Committee's attention to pending consideration by the Committee of information prepared by the host country regarding immunities of mem-

**Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations (Resolution 169 (II), October 31, 1947).

bers of missions to the United Nations participating in criminal proceedings. The U.S. Representative expressed the hope that the information would lead to greater participation by the diplomatic community in such proceedings and to more successful prosecutions.

On March 21 the observer for Viet Nam protested acts of violence carried out against its mission and staff on February 8 by "a group of hooligans and anti-Viet Nam elements." It requested that those guilty of those acts be brought to account and punished by the American authorities. In reply, the U.S. Representative expressed his concern about the incident and said that the matter would receive his prompt personal attention.

Also on March 21, the Representative of France requested U.S. authorities to inform officials at John F. Kennedy airport of accelerated immigration and customs procedures. The U.S. Representative expressed the hope that immigration procedures at the airport would improve and assured members of the Committee that everything possible would be done to help the proper functioning of missions.

Finally, on March 21, the Representative of France requested information on the timetable for introducing the new tax-exemption procedure introduced in some U.S. States. The U.S. Representative said these new procedures might take some time.

On June 4 the observer of Afghanistan drew the Committee's attention to the practice by U.S. embassies and consular offices of denying requests by Afghan diplomats accredited to the United Nations for multiple reentry visas. He said difficulties had been encountered when the Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the United Nations applied for a visa at the U.S. Consulate in Geneva in May to return to New York. In reply, the U.S. Representative said it was untrue that the United States has deliberately created difficulties in issuing the visa. Difficulties arose when the date and place of issuance of the visa had been changed by the requesting party without adequate notification.

Again on June 4, the observer of the Ukrainian S.S.R. raised the question of the undue time required to clear shipments through customs and proposed that airline authorities, upon receipt of a shipment, inform the missions concerned by telephone of its arrival to facilitate acceleration of documents processing and help avoid undue payment of storage fees.

On March 13, 18, and 21, June 4, and October 30, the Committee met to consider protests by the Missions of the U.S.S.R., Byelorussian S.S.R., and Ukrainian S.S.R. over a U.S. demand that they reduce the size of the staffs of their missions. In state-

ments before the Committee, the representatives of these countries claimed the U.S. action violated its responsibilities under the UN Headquarters Agreement and constituted a violation of international law, which, they argued, did not give the host country the right to impose numerical limits on the size of the staff of UN missions. In reply, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Herbert Okun, defended the U.S. action, arguing that when the Headquarters Agreement was negotiated it was recognized that, for reasons of security, limits could be placed on the size of UN missions. The Soviet Mission had grown to an unreasonable level; it was currently larger in size than the two next-largest missions combined. The U.S. action was reasonable and consistent with its responsibilities. He affirmed that the United States was prepared to engage in consultations with the affected parties on the matter, as the UN Legal Counsel had recommended.

PROTECTION OF PERSONS UNDER DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT

Among the draft instruments pending before the General Assembly, the United States has accorded priority to the "Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons Under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment." This draft text was prepared by the UN Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and was forwarded to the General Assembly via the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. Prior to the 35th Session of the General Assembly, the United States submitted detailed comments on the Draft Principles, in response to a request from the Secretary-General. At the beginning of the 35th Session, moreover, the United States took the lead in ensuring that the text would be considered in a formal working group of the Third Committee. The 35th Session recommended the matter be transferred to the Sixth Committee.

The Sixth Committee formed working groups during the 36th, 37th, and 38th Sessions, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Luigi Ferrari Bravo of Italy, and during the 39th, 40th, and 41st Sessions, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Tullio Treves of Italy. Despite the best efforts of the Chairmen and the working group members, progress has been somewhat slow. At the 36th Session, Principles 7 and 8 were adopted; at the 37th Session, Principles 9 through 13; at the 38th Session, Principles 14 through 18; and at the 39th Session, Principles 19 through 21(1). At the 40th Session, Principles 29 through 35 were provisionally adopted. At the 41st Session the Working Group adopted paragraph 2 of Principle 22,

Principles 23 to 28, and definitions of arrest, detention, and imprisonment. It also reworded Principle 13, which had been provisionally adopted at the 37th Session.

In Decision 41/418, the General Assembly decided on December 3 that an open-ended working group again be established in the Sixth Committee at the 42d Session, with a view to expediting the completion of the Draft Principles. The General Assembly also requested the Secretary-General to circulate the report of the 1986 working group.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

The Sixth Committee of the 41st General Assembly considered the item "Progressive Development of the Principles and Norms of International Law Relations to the New International Economic Order: Report of the Secretary-General" (NIEO) at four meetings on November 18-20 and November 26.

On November 26 the Philippines on behalf of 14 cosponsors introduced a draft resolution, slightly amended by Ethiopia from the floor, recommending:

. . . that the consideration of the most appropriate procedure for completing the elaboration of the process of progressive development of the relevant principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order, and of the forum which would be entrusted with the task, be undertaken by the General Assembly at its forty-second session

This resolution was approved by the Committee by a vote of 93 to 0, with 21 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States, in an explanation of its vote, stated that in its view the concept of a NIEO was in such a preliminary stage of evolution that the consideration of the progressive development of international legal principles concerning it was premature. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly (Resolution 41/73) on December 3 by a vote of 131 to 0, with 23 (U.S.) abstentions.

FOSTER PLACEMENT AND ADOPTION OF CHILDREN

A draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally was submitted to the General Assembly by ECOSOC in 1981. Informal consultations carried out prior to the Assembly session and in the Sixth Committee during the subsequent 5 years resulted in an agreed amended text, which was adopted by the Assem-

bly without a vote on December 3 as an annex to Resolution 41/85.

Part 5

Budget, Administration, and Institutional Management

INTRODUCTION

The focus of U.S. participation in the United Nations regarding budget, administration, and institutional management in 1986 was on UN reform. As discussed below, the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts (Group of 18), which was established toward the close of the 40th General Assembly to work on fundamental reform of UN administrative and financial practices, met several times throughout 1986 and issued its report to the 41st General Assembly.

The emphasis on UN reform built upon the continuing U.S. priority for assuring that international organization budgets reflected conservative fiscal policies and effective management. The budget policy continued to be zero real growth and maximum absorption of nondiscretionary cost increases. In seeking this goal and working toward more comprehensive UN Reform, the United States sought to join its efforts with those of other major contributors. UN agency programs, budgets, and administrative practices continued to be carefully reviewed in an effort to assure that resources were being allocated to activities of greatest importance and that the activities were being implemented with the greatest efficiency possible.

The U.S. emphasis on fiscal restraint continued to gain impetus from two Congressional initiatives of the previous year which affected U.S. assessed contributions to international organizations. The Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment (Section 143 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, P.L. 99-93) directly concerned the budgetary practices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation (the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, P.L. 99-177) is not directed specifically at the United Nations and its specialized agencies but clearly sets the overall budgetary context

within which appropriations for assessed contributions to international organizations must be considered.

The work of the General Assembly's Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) is related to the work of all other main UN committees. It deals with organization-wide administrative problems, such as conference scheduling, personnel issues, and the coordination of activities among various UN organizations. Before the General Assembly votes on any resolution having financial implications, the Fifth Committee must provide information on how the resolution, if adopted, will affect the UN budget. In its most important role, the Fifth Committee makes recommendations to the General Assembly on the regular program budget and on assessed peacekeeping budgets.

Several special UN bodies—some consisting of experts serving in their personal capacities and some of an intergovernmental nature—assist in this work. In financial matters, the best known of the expert committees are the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Committee on Contributions. The ACABQ examines the Secretary-General's proposals and reports to the General Assembly on the UN budget and UN accounts; on the administrative budgets of the UN specialized agencies; and on other administrative, financial, and budgetary matters referred to it. The Committee on Contributions advises the General Assembly on all questions relating to the apportionment of UN expenses among UN members. Other expert financial bodies are the Board of Auditors, the Investment Committee (which advises on the management of the Pension Fund), and the UN Joint Staff Pension Board.

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), composed of experts in the personnel field, makes recommendations to the General Assembly for the regulation and coordination of conditions of service within the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and other international organizations that participate in the UN common system of salaries, allowances, and other benefits. The Committee on Conferences is an intergovernmental, administrative body which seeks to develop a workable calendar of UN meetings and advises the Assembly on the most efficient use of conference resources and on current and future requirements.

A senior executive committee, an intergovernmental body, and an expert group have responsibilities ranging broadly across the work of the whole UN system of organizations. The Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC)—composed of the UN Secretary-General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies, the IAEA, and other major bodies and programs—meets

regularly to supervise the implementation of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and to coordinate the activities of the various organizations. The Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC), an intergovernmental body, serves as the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming, and coordination. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), a group of experts who serve full time, is empowered to investigate and evaluate any matter bearing on the efficiency of services and the proper use of funds.

Finally, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, acting independently, have, over the years, established *ad hoc* committees that have sought to reorganize various aspects of the UN system in order to make it work more effectively toward the goals sought by Member States. Most recently, as discussed below, the 40th General Assembly established a Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts to work on fundamental reform of UN administrative and financial arrangements.

Each of these bodies is concerned with some aspect of making the system work better. The highlights of their activities during 1986 are recounted in the sections that follow.

UN REFORM

The UN General Assembly enacted by consensus on December 19, 1986, a far-reaching set of administrative and financial reforms. The Resolution, 41/213, puts into effect a comprehensive administrative and budgetary reform program recommended by the Group of 18 High-Level experts, and also initiates a new budget review process which will give the United States and other Member States more direct control over the size and content of the United Nations Program Budget. The key feature of the UN action is a budget mechanism which has been devised containing four essential elements:

- a budget ceiling;
- an indication of program priorities;
- a provision for a limited contingency fund which will protect the budget from constant add-ons; and
- most importantly, a consensus decision-making process.

The primary concern of the Congress in enacting the Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment (Section 143 of P.L. 99-93) was to address the fundamental disequilibrium between the size of contributions by Member States and their influence on the UN budgetary process. The United Nations scale of assessments, based on capacity to pay and including additional hardship allowances, has a

built-in lack of fiscal restraint for the great majority of members. This in turn fosters fiscal irresponsibility in the basic budget decision-making procedures. Thus, an overwhelming majority of UN members contribute little to the budget, which leaves them with little direct incentive to take a serious interest in making realistic and responsible budget decisions.

The consensus based budgeting system that has now been adopted in the General Assembly redresses that balance and assures that budgetary decisions cannot be made in simple disregard of the view of the major donor states. This process has the effect of reducing the ability of the numerical majority to dictate decisions about the size and use of UN resources. If the resort to majority power cannot simply be assumed, real compromise becomes essential. Trade-offs must be achieved between minority and majority viewpoints, involving the exchange and modification of tangible interests. That is why the reformed program budget decision-making process is so significant. Decisions taken on a consensus basis regarding spending matters in the CPC, which we expect to be respected by the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly, will have the effect of reducing the ability of the numerical majority to dictate decisions about the size and use of UN resources.

In addition to the new program budget process, the reform package calls for significant staff reductions (15 percent over 3 years and 25 percent at the Assistant Secretary General level and above), cuts in costs for conferences, travel, and consultants and a major reorganization of the broad range of overlapping economic and social activities.

The reform effort began at the 40th Session of the General Assembly, when Japan's Foreign Minister proposed that a Group of High Level Intergovernmental Experts be established to review the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations. The Japanese proposal was accepted by consensus and the Group was established. The Group of 18, as it came to be known, met for 8 weeks in January-August 1986, and presented its report to the 41st General Assembly.

The Group of 18 report made 71 recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations. Twelve of the recommendations were explicitly to reduce expenditures such as the reductions in staff, travel, consultant costs, and overtime. Other recommendations were to reorganize or rationalize the procedures, structure, and programs of the Secretariat and intergovernmental organs, e.g., transfer the special economic assistance programs to the UN Development Program (UNDP), have UNDP

assume the UN Disaster Relief Organization's function, and integrate the Center for Science and Technology for Development into other areas of the UN Secretariat. Another bloc of recommendations was aimed at improving personnel policies and improving staff morale by establishing predictable career paths, fair performance evaluations, and reasonable prospects for promotion based on merit. Two recommendations were directed towards recognizing the precept of an independent international civil service by limiting fixed term employees to 50 percent of the nationals recruited from any Member State. The Soviet countries and the Chinese did not agree to these recommendations and a reservation was entered into the Group of 18 report. Other recommendations call for studies and reports to the General Assembly.

During the General Debate at the 41st General Assembly, 63 Member States mentioned the Group of 18 report, and during the debate on the report under Agenda Item 38, 76 Member States addressed the issue. From the statements, it became clear that some of the 18 states represented on the Group of 18 would not fully support the recommendations of the Group. This was most evident in the cases of Algeria, Cameroon, and Mexico. Most developing Member States were guardedly in support of reform but strongly opposed to consensus decisionmaking in the budget process and to any indication that programs would be reduced.

The Fifth Committee examined the report from October 16 to November 5. Throughout that period, the U.S. Delegation, with support from others, fought to preserve the integrity of the Group of 18 recommendations and to avoid any Fifth Committee finding that would prejudice Plenary consideration of the item. After tedious debate, an intensive negotiation produced the Fifth Committee Report (A/41/795) which was sent to Plenary on November 6, 1986.

After considerable consultations, including the formation of small drafting groups, a Group of 19 began drafting what would become the final resolution. The President of the General Assembly, Choudhury, drew together a smaller group of six delegations (United States, the Soviet Union, China, India, Brazil, and Cape Verde as Chairman of the African Group) to negotiate the most difficult issue, the consensus decisionmaking mechanism. The result was an acceptable consensus mechanism. It was achieved by reaffirming the Charter and Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, agreeing that the Committee for Program and Coordination would continue its existing practice of reaching decisions by consensus, and expressing the desirability that the Fifth Committee make all possible efforts with a view to establishing the broadest possible agreement on budget issues.

The resulting Resolution, 41/213, calls for the implementation of the Group of 18 recommendations, and provides for a new program budget decision process that contains the essential elements that the United States was seeking.

Current Financial Crisis of the UN

The Secretary-General of the United Nations called the General Assembly into a resumed session of the 40th UNGA in April 1986 to deal with the financial crisis of the UN. According to the Secretary-General's report, the United Nations was "confronted by financial problems of such magnitude as to have profound implications on the viability of the organization . . . but it is above all a political crisis arising from disregard for obligations flowing from the Charter and from lack of agreement among Member States on how to finance and utilize the Organization and for what purposes."

The Secretary-General reported that arrears of \$242.4 million had accumulated by the end of 1985. All available resources, including the Working Capital Fund and the Special Account, had been exhausted to meet the arrearages and late payments. Thus, no funds were available to cover the \$105 million deficit projected in 1986, \$75 million in arrears, and \$30 in exchange rate losses. The Secretary-General in January and March announced savings measures, including: a 20-percent cut in travel, consultants, temporary assistance, and overtime; deferring maintenance and alteration projects, freezing recruitment, and promotions, etc. These measures were estimated to save \$30 million. He then submitted a further \$30 million in proposed savings to the Member States at the resumed session, including canceled and curtailed meetings, postponement of two major construction projects, reduced acquisition of furniture and equipment, and curtailment of publications and some program activities.

The resumed session, after much debate, agreed to the package of cuts proposed by the Secretary-General. Although the combined total of \$60 million in savings did not come close to the combined regular budget deficits of \$105 million projected by the Secretary-General, the short-term cash situation of the United Nations at the end of 1986 was no worse, indeed slightly better, than it had been at the end of 1985. The Secretary-General, in his report on the financial emergency to the 41st General Assembly, attributed the improvement to payment in full by two Member States and partial payment by four others of previously withheld regular budget contributions and voluntary contributions by three

Member States to the Special Account, which is used to help the cash flow situation.

The actual increase in contributions outstanding to the UN regular budget and more than half of the increase in the deficit of the peacekeeping accounts was due to reduced contributions by the United States. The Soviet Union actually decreased outstanding contributions to the UN regular budget in 1986 while the U.S. arrearage grew by over \$60 million to 57 percent of contributions outstanding to the regular budget.

At the 41st General Assembly, the financial emergency of the United Nations was considered by the Fifth Committee in three sessions between November 28 and December 4, 1986. Discussion was limited and no new ideas emerged. The United States did not speak on this topic.

The draft resolution approved by the Fifth Committee and forwarded to the General Assembly was again broken into two parts. Part A urged Member States to pay their contributions in full and Part B called on the Secretary-General to economize on the special postage stamps project, so as to maximize the net revenue available to the organization. Both parts were adopted by consensus.

The General Assembly adopted the draft resolution without a vote on December 11, 1986. (Resolution 41/204 A & B)

UN Budget

On December 11, 1986, the Fifth Committee completed action on the Program Budget recommending by a vote of 82 in favor to 14 (U.S.) opposed with 9 abstentions, revised expenditure estimates of \$1,711,801,200 for the biennium. The revised expenditure level is \$48,459,700 higher than the amount approved by the 40th UN General Assembly. The 23 countries voting against or abstaining on the Fifth Committee vote were collectively assessed 81.21 percent of the budget. Three-quarters of the increase was related to revisions of currency rates, offset in part by reduced inflation and standard salary cost rates. Budget additions attributable to resolutions considered in the Main Committees and Plenary, as well as revised estimates submitted by the Secretary General to the Fifth Committee, totaled \$12 million.

The Secretary-General submitted a very limited number of revised estimates to the Fifth Committee requiring an increase of \$1.7 million. Of this amount, \$1 million was required to fund general liability insurance for headquarters. Budget add-ons resulting from resolutions adopted by other Main Committees and Plenary totaled \$9.5 million, far below levels approved at recent Gen-

eral Assembly Sessions. None of the resolutions recommended by the Second Committee, which in the past, has been a source of significant budget add-ons, required an additional appropriation. An exception to this favorable trend was the additional appropriation required to implement resolutions adopted by Plenary on the Question of Namibia. Also, in past years, the addition of new conferences and meetings to the calendar of conferences required budget add-ons of \$5 million or more. At this session, a limited number of meetings were authorized and the Fifth Committee approved the ACABQ recommended funding level of \$2.8 million for conferences.

The decline in the value of the dollar added \$83.2 million to the budget. Downward revisions of inflation estimates and a decrease in staff assessment offset more than one-half of the budget increase attributable to this decline.

Speaking in the Fifth Committee on December 8, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Michael Michalski, explained his government's negative vote:

The increase in net requirements of approximately \$60 million [Note: \$48 million in expenditures plus a \$12 million decrease in income] over the level approved at the 40th Session is excessive at a time when many national budgets are frozen or declining in both nominal and real terms. No effort has been made to absorb the effect of exchange rate changes, which in contrast to recent years, are now adding significantly to the budget. Our policy toward the UN budget includes a stipulation that nondiscretionary increases, such as those attributable to changes in currency rates, should be absorbed to the maximum.

Mr. Michalski stated further that there was much to commend in the budget, “. . . and in particular the efforts of the Secretary-General and Member States, to show restraint.” He noted that the reduced level of budget add-ons was an important sign that budgetary restraint was taking hold in the organization. He concluded his statement by indicating that “Despite these encouraging signs, we must not lose sight of the urgent need for reform. Implementation of the Group of 18's recommendations, and an improved budget decisionmaking process are essential for the long-term viability of the organization.”

On December 11, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 41/211 by a recorded vote of 122 in favor to 13 (U.S.) opposed with 10 abstentions.

Audit Reports

The Fifth Committee considered the audit report of the United Nations for the biennium ending December 31, 1984, and the 1984 Board of Auditors reports of the voluntarily funded UN

Development Program (UNDP), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), voluntary funds administered by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UN Environment Program (UNDEP), the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the UN Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation (Habitat), and the UN Industrial Development Fund (UNIDF) at nine sessions from September 26 to November 17, 1986.

The U.S. Representative to the Fifth Committee, Ambassador Joseph V. Reed, reemphasized the importance attached to the Audit Reports by the United States, noting that they were an essential tool for judging how individual UN agencies utilized the funds entrusted to them. He commended the Board of Auditors for its fine work.

He noted that the Audit Reports of the United Nations itself, UNICEF, and UNHCR, revealed significant financial management problems. The other agencies, while problems were noted, had no egregious practices. In some instances serious lapses were found in the UN, UNICEF, and UNHCR internal control mechanisms, resulting in waste inefficiency, and in some instances, fraud. Particularly disturbing was the fact that these same problems had been noted in previous audit reports, indicating the Administrators of the organizations did not always take their accountability to contributors seriously. Only in the case of UNHCR, which had a new High Commissioner, was there evidence of serious efforts to improve management techniques.

As a consequence of the repeated failure of some administrators to adequately respond to the auditors' criticisms, the United States proposed a draft resolution on the audit reports designed to increase the responsiveness required by the agencies to criticisms noted in audit reports. It calls for the Board of Auditors to monitor progress on UN accounting information, the investigation of Headquarters catering and gift shop operations, improvement of financial management in travel services and competitive bidding procedures, and to report on their findings to the General Assembly; requests the bodies of all organizations to review the audit reports, comments by the Fifth Committee and remedial actions taken or planned by agency heads in response to the audit reports, and invites Member States on the governing bodies to ensure that their representatives give full consideration to the audit reports. After a slightly revised draft was introduced by the Chairman of the Committee on November 17, the Committee adopted it without a vote. The General Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote on December 5. (Resolution 41/176)

Financing Peacekeeping Operations

The 41st General Assembly passed financing resolution for both the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) and UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). The Fifth Committee had forwarded both draft resolutions.

On December 3 the General Assembly passed a resolution (41/44 A) appropriating the \$18,282,000 which had been authorized previously by Resolution 40/59 A, for the financing of UNDOF for the period June 1 to November 30, 1986. It further appropriated \$17,400,000 for December 1, 1986, to May 31, 1987, and authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments at a rate not to exceed \$2,900,000 per month for the period June 1 to November 30, 1987, provided the Security Council extended the mandate beyond May 31, 1987, as approved in Security Council Resolution 590 (1986) of November 26, 1986. The resolution was passed by a margin of 110 (U.S.) to 3, with 21 abstentions.

On December 5 the General Assembly passed a resolution by a vote of 125 (U.S.) to 2 with 9 abstentions which provided continued financing for UNIFIL. (Resolution 41/179 A) The resolution appropriated \$35,872,000 for April 19 to July 18, 1986, \$59,787,500 for July 19 to December 18, 1986, and \$16,579,000 for December 19, 1986, to January 18, 1987. It also authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments at a rate not to exceed \$12,125,000 per month for the 12-month period beginning January 19, 1987, provided the Security Council renewed its mandate. The Security Council renewed the mandate until July 31, 1987, to January 15, 1987. (Security Council Resolution 594-1987)

The Soviet Union announced in April that it would begin paying its UNIFIL assessments. Previously it had not paid because it questioned the legality or political appropriateness of UN peacekeeping operations. The U.S.S.R. has indicated that it will not make payments for prior mandate periods. Accordingly, the U.S.S.R.'s arrearage of almost \$173 million for UNIFIL will remain. Its arrearages for UNDOF were another \$24.8 million.

Because of shortfalls in appropriations, P.L. 99-177, and the post adjustment (Kasten) Amendment (P.L. 98-473), the United States also has significant arrearages for UNIFIL. For UNDOF and UNIFIL these totaled \$31.2 million on December 31, 1986, of which \$30.5 million was for UNIFIL and \$700,000 for UNDOF.

INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

Scales of Assessment

At its 40th Session (1985), the General Assembly approved the scale of assessments for 1986–88, but did not provide guidance to the Committee on Contributions regarding the methodology to be used in formulating future scales of assessment.

Absent specific guidance from the UNGA, the Committee on Contributions, at its 1986 session, focused on two major tasks: (1) a review of alternative methodologies undertaken in accordance with its continuing mandate; and (2) an examination of the problems of data comparability. In its review of alternative methodologies, the Committee considered a study on methods of assessment in various international organizations as well as the UN peace-keeping operations. Four alternatives were discussed but no definitive conclusions were reached. The Committee on Contributions felt further guidance from the General Assembly was needed.

Of the four alternatives, only one was based primarily on the capacity to pay principle. The four methods discussed were:

1. Groupings—membership would be divided into three groups: (a) developed market economy countries; (b) centrally planned economies; and (c) developing countries. Under this method, percentage shares allocated to each group and, in turn to each member, would be a political decision of the Fifth Committee.

2. Combination of Criteria—the scale would be based on three distinct factors: (a) permanent membership in the Security Council; (b) sovereign equality; and (c) capacity to pay.

3. Additional Apportionment to Non-Permanent Members of the Security Council—non—permanent members of the Security Council would be assessed an additional 0.5 to 1 percent of the budget during their 2-year term on the Council.

4. Core and Non-Core Budget—the UN budget would be divided into core and non-core portions for which there would be different criteria in determining assessments. The core portion would consist of those activities fundamental to the basic purposes of the United Nations. The non-core portion would include technical cooperation, operational and specific assistance activities. All members would be assessed for the core component and the non-core portion would be financed from voluntary contributions.

Regarding data comparability, the Committee noted that with respect to the problem of establishing a uniform data base, data from its two major sources, the World Bank and the UN Statisti-

cal Office were generally compatible. The Committee decided to dispense with the comprehensive national accounts questionnaire and urged members to complete an annual questionnaire sent out by the Statistical Office. The Scale of Assessments would be established on the basis of data provided in the annual questionnaire.

The Fifth Committee considered the Report of the Committee on Contributions at seven sessions between October 3d and November 19, 1986. As a result of its deliberations, the Fifth Committee adopted, without a vote, a draft resolution on November 19th. After approval by the Fifth Committee, the resolution was adopted, also without a vote, by the General Assembly on December 5th. (Resolution 41/178) The resolution, *inter alia*, recognized that capacity to pay was the fundamental criterion for determining the scales of assessment. The resolution requested the Committee on Contributions to continue its work on methodologies for drawing up an equitable scale and requested the Committee to submit a progress report on its work to the 42d UN General Assembly.

The following table represents the U.S. share of the assessed budget of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the IAEA for the calendar years 1986 and 1987.

	1986 per- cent	1987 per- cent
UN	25.00	25.00
FAO	25.00	25.00
ICAO	25.00	25.00
ILO	25.00	25.00
WHO	25.00	25.00
UNIDO	25.00	25.00
WMO	24.71	24.68
ITU	7.63	7.65
IMO	5.09	5.33
UPU	5.10	5.11
WIPO*	5.36	5.36
IAEA	25.891	25.874

*Proportion of combined U.S. assessments for the three conventions to which the United States pays assessments.

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAM AND COORDINATION

The 21-member CPC* is the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming, and coordination. The Committee was scheduled to hold its 26th Session in New York from April 28 to May 30, 1986. However, in conformity with General Assembly decision 40/472 of May 9, which approved the Secretary-General's proposal to shorten various meetings in order to save money, the Committee concluded its work a week early on May 23. The major topics considered were (1) revisions to the medium-term plan for 1984-89; (2) program performance for 1984-85; (3) review of certain evaluation activities; (4) a cross-organizational program analysis (COPA) on economic and social research and policy analysis in the UN system; and (5) possible improvements to the policies and work of the Committee under its mandate.

At its summer session, ECOSOC endorsed the CPC's conclusions and recommendations. (Resolution 1986/51) The 41st General Assembly considered CPC's report again under its agenda item on program planning. The CPC recommendations were approved without change and without a vote on December 11. (Resolution 41/203)

REVISIONS TO THE MEDIUM-TERM PLAN

This was the final set of proposed changes to the Plan which will be totally rewritten in 1988 for the period 1990-95. The Committee's attention to detail in its review of this document was considerable, although almost all of the proposed changes were minor text revisions, clarifications, or amendments which did not significantly alter the document's content or impact. Two issues that received prolonged attention concerned women's programs (particularly those related to a possible fourth world conference) and the administrative issue of merging a subprogram on transnational crime with an already existing subprogram. Both issues were finally settled to the general satisfaction of the Committee.

The Committee also reviewed a report on the experience gained in the implementation of measures taken to provide statements of program budget implications for new or revised programs. The Secretary-General reported no problems in the implementation of this requirement, and the Committee focused its attention on whether the requirement should be extended to

*Members in 1986 were Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cameroon, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Liberia, Netherlands, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia, and Zambia.

ECOSOC and other subsidiary bodies. After a good deal of discussion, the CPC recommended extending the requirement to ECOSOC for a 2-year trial period. The CPC accepted the Secretary-General's request to defer extending the requirement to any further subsidiary bodies (e.g., the regional commissions) because there were not yet enough people trained to do the work.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE FOR 1984-85

Due to the late issuance of the program performance report the Committee was unable to conduct a detailed and systematic review. Nevertheless, the Committee made several recommendations on measures to enhance the utility of future program performance reports, including greater standardization of the presentation of data from section to section. The only significant problem which arose was an attempt by one delegation to alter the criteria by which the Secretary-General may exercise discretion regarding the termination of program elements during a budget cycle. The proposal, which the United States opposed, would have eliminated such discretionary power by requiring the Secretary-General to receive CPC permission before any terminations were carried out. Opinion in the Committee was divided on this proposal, and eventually it was withdrawn.

REVIEW OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

The Committee considered a new evaluation report on the UN population program. Many delegates were critical of the report, referring specifically to the low rate of response to the data-gathering questionnaire and emphasizing that this was a major obstacle to the reliability of the summary data and conclusions. Many also felt that the report was excessively long, given the low questionnaire response rate on which everything was based. Nonetheless, the Committee approved a set of recommendations which encouraged greater attention to this activity by Member States and the UN system.

Also considered was a report on the activities of the Department of Public Information, which followed up an evaluation done in 1983. Several delegations felt that the report was inadequate in its treatment of both the UN radio service and the press release function at Headquarters. Others criticized the obviously growing delay in the publication of documents such as the *Yearbook* and the *Chronicle*. The U.S. Representative proposed the abolition of both publications and called for a report on the cost to the United Nations itself of handling and distributing printed materials pro-

duced by the specialized agencies. Although there was a brief attempt by another delegation to have this request rejected, the United States successfully defended its inclusion in the Committee's recommendations. The Director of the Department of Public Information insisted that all backlogged issues of the *Chronicle* were being published in a timely fashion and that in the future it would be a quarterly rather than a monthly publication.

A related question arose when the Committee reviewed a special report on the News Service of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs. The United States and some others favored the abolition of this service or at least its reassignment to another part of the Secretariat. Several other delegations strongly opposed this and compromise proved impossible. Accordingly, the Committee could only agree to request the Secretary-General to give further consideration to this issue and to report thereon to the 41st General Assembly, taking into account the overall effectiveness of the Service, the need to avoid duplication of activities, and the views expressed by Committee members.

In considering a special report on the hiring and use of consultants, the Committee criticized the lack of specifics presented and noted that the history of this subject was much more complex than the report indicated. Members asserted that the UN system used too many consultants, that their contribution to the work of the Secretariat was not well-defined, that Committee members had no idea of the real value or necessity of the work done by consultants, and that there was an unacceptable lack of financial analysis in the report. As a consequence, the Committee referred to a complementary report that was being prepared for submission to the 41st General Assembly, and requested that its completion date be advanced so that it would be available to the summer session of ECOSOC, which could then review both reports together. Some CPC members were particularly concerned about the lack of data on the nationalities of UN consultants and stressed the importance of hiring them on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

CROSS ORGANIZATIONAL PROGRAM ANALYSES (COPA)

The Committee's primary COPA concerned social research and policy analysis in the UN system. The Committee stressed the importance of research on economic and social issues, and recommended, *inter alia*, that a summary of system-wide research findings be submitted biennially to ECOSOC, a closer relation be established between research undertaken and the medium-term plan, and the Dag Hammarskjöld Library be designated a central

repository for all research findings in order to further sharing among organizations.

The followup to an earlier COPA on human settlements indicated considerable failure to carry out CPC recommendations regarding coordination and the establishment of priorities. The United States called for a strong reaction to this, and the Committee formally requested the chairman of the Commission on Human Settlements to make greater efforts to carry out these recommendations.

In considering a general report on the results of past COPAs, the Committee agreed that it should call for a procedure which would assure that agencies gave as much attention to recommendations by CPC as they did those from other intergovernmental bodies. It also agreed that the scope of future COPAs, where appropriate, should be narrowed and more attention paid to specificity in the content of recommendations.

The Committee also reviewed a report by the Secretary-General on recurrent publications of the United Nations, which indicated that none could be eliminated. The United States expressed concern that this negative reply not be allowed to end consideration of this topic and insisted that further action be taken by CPC. The United States called for the UN Publications Board to assume responsibility for review of recurrent publications with the goal of eliminating those deemed obsolete. The U.S. proposal was adopted, and CPC requested an implementation report for its 1987 session.

IMPROVING THE WORK OF CPC

This topic brought out lengthy debate and a wide range of views on the Committee's role in the United Nations. Virtually every delegation presented both a general statement and specific comments on the working paper prepared by the Secretary-General. There was wide agreement that the CPC needed to revitalize its role, but much disagreement about how that could best be accomplished. Ultimately the Committee recognized that it must exercise its responsibilities in setting program priorities and take a broader view of its tasks. However, one delegation insisted that the CPC must also continue its very detailed review of the program budget. The United States countered that the Committee must adopt a broad management approach in order to achieve any meaningful reform. This approach would be based on taking into account (1) trends, (2) relative priorities, (3) fulfillment of objectives, (4) timeliness, (5) efficiency, and (6) cross-organizational analysis.

Because the opposing views of the United States and the other delegation could not be reconciled, the Committee compromised. It endorsed the broad management approach advocated by the United States, but agreed that detailed review of the program budget remained necessary. The result was no radical reform of the work principles of the CPC, but at least a recognition that there was a need for change, and provision of a means by which such reform could evolve.

The CPC's conclusions and recommendations on improving its work were subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution on reform (41/213) as well as its resolution on program planning (41/203).

Joint Inspection Unit (JIU)

The JIU consists of 11 inspectors chosen for their background and knowledge,* who are authorized to investigate matters pertaining to efficient and effective operations in the UN system. The Unit focuses on improving management of programs and agencies and encouraging greater coordination at all levels. The JIU statute is currently adhered to by 16 UN system agencies.

In 1986 the JIU published 11 reports on such topics as UNHRC regional operations in Africa; cash management policies; interpretation services; field representation of UN organizations; staff-management relations in the United Nations; and various aspects of technical cooperation activities. Some of these reports involved the work carried out by individual organizations, while others were cross-organizational studies of topics with system-wide relevance. Because some of these reports were issued late in the year, and consideration of others was deferred for a year by the 41st General Assembly, most of these reports will not be addressed by UN agencies until well into 1987.

Of the greatest potential importance to UN management operations this year was the JIU report which reviewed the organization and methods for official travel of UN staff. The Inspector's goal was to present an advocacy for the establishment of an employee-staffed travel agency in UN Headquarters. In the effort to do this, the report also revealed the need for a more focused effort by the UN Secretariat to obtain the lowest possible air fare rates for official travel.

Another important report revealed the enormous growth in the UN's system of field representation, which grew from 360

*Inspectors are appointed by the General Assembly to serve in a personal capacity for 5-year terms. Richard V. Hennes of the United States was an Inspector during 1986.

field offices in 1973 to 550 just 10 years later, with a concomitant 44-percent growth in the size of the field staff establishment. The cost of maintaining all of this grew about 300 percent during the same period. For the United States the most important part of this report is the recommendation to establish formal criteria for the evaluation of proposals for future field office expansion and regulatory mechanism to expedite Member States' review and control of such proposals.

The other major topic in this report dealt with the role of the UN Resident Coordinators and their relationship to the rest of the UN field office establishment. This particular material is of primary importance to the Secretariat, but it also gives Member States an excellent analysis of the role and proper functioning of the position, as well as a good perspective on ways to improve the functioning of field offices, their proper relationship to the host government, and the principles which should guide the UNDP Resident Representative and the director of the UN Information Center in the performance of their respective roles.

The last management report which the United States considered of special significance dealt with cash management policies in five of the largest UN agencies. The report reviewed their general procedures, with emphasis on adherence to regulations, prudent management, modernization efforts, and interagency cooperation. The general conclusion was that cash flow management was being handled very satisfactorily. No glaring errors in procedure were apparent to the Inspector, and it appeared that overall the surveyed agencies were performing adequately to maximize the return on their funds and minimize risks. The Inspector accorded the agencies high marks for safeguarding income and investing for growth. The report also sympathized with agencies' struggles to collect both assessed and pledged voluntary contributions and recommended an incentive plan which would reward prompt payers. For several reasons, the United States did not support this recommendation but was pleased that the JIU was so favorably impressed with the cash management aspect of agencies' financial operations.

During the 41st General Assembly, the Fifth Committee decided to postpone consideration of the agenda item on JIU reports, including the annual report on the work of the JIU and the proposed work schedule for 1987. These and other agenda items were deferred in order to permit sufficient time for Member States to review and discuss the proposals for UN reform which were then before the General Assembly. Hopefully, one of the results of the reform effort will be greater attention to JIU reports

and their recommendations for better management of the UN system.

Committee on Conferences

The Committee on Conferences met for only 1 week during 1986, concluding its substantive session August 29th. It adopted two U.S. proposals on:

1. Limiting the number of planning missions dispatched to cities where UN Conference facilities exist or where UN Conferences have previously been held; and

2. Calling for a review of the procedures followed by the Department of Conference Services to UN Organizations and programs not funded from the UN regular budget.

The Committee also adopted a proposal to limit the number of UN organs entitled to receive summary records.

As a result of this meeting, the Committee submitted a four-part draft resolution for General Assembly approval. The Fifth Committee considered the draft resolution at five meetings from October 1 through November 26.

In her statement on the draft resolution, the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Susan Shearouse, indicated there had been an encouraging change from the Committee's previous inability to take decisive action. She endorsed the proposals that had emerged promoting the efficient utilization of conference-servicing resources. She stated the United States supported " . . . the decision of the Committee to maintain communications with those organizations which have repeatedly underutilized available resources." "If the situation does not improve," she said, "the Committee must be prepared to take on a regulatory posture and challenge organizations which ignore the mandates of the General Assembly. It is imperative that UN organizations recognize the need for, and strive for, a more efficient use of conference resources."

Mrs. Shearouse stated that the United States supported the renewal of the Committee on Conferences' mandate on the assumption that it " . . . will continue to evolve into an effective mechanism for managing conference servicing resources. At a time when fiscal restraint is so imperative, the Committee on Conferences must do more to ensure efficient use of the limited resources available." She called on the Committee to assume an assertive role in this respect.

On November 26 the Fifth Committee adopted, without a vote, the draft resolution on the Pattern of Conferences as modi-

fied slightly by the Chairman. It contained provisions that, *inter alia*, (1) approved the draft calendar of conferences for 1987, (2) renewed the mandate of the Committee on Conferences for another year from 1 January 1987; (3) requested the Committee to consider, as a matter of priority, the possibility of changing its terms of reference and becoming a permanent intergovernmental body; (4) adopted guidelines for the dispatch of planning missions, and (5) decided to extend for 3 years the experimental period established by Resolution 37/14 C, during which no subsidiary organization of the General Assembly shall be entitled to summary records, with stated exceptions.

On December 5, 1986, the General Assembly adopted Resolution 41/177 without a vote.

International Civil Service Commission

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), a 15-member body of recognized experts,* is responsible for making recommendations on salaries, allowances, and other benefits and conditions of service for employees of the United Nations and specialized agencies that are participants in the Common System of salaries and allowances. The Commission was in session twice during 1986. It met for 3 weeks in Nairobi in March and again for 3 weeks in New York in July. The 12th annual report of the Commission was submitted to the General Assembly in October. The Fifth Committee considered this item at 10 meetings between November 7 and December 8. Extensive informal consultations preceded the introduction of the draft resolution to the full Fifth Committee.

Pensionable remuneration was a key subject before the Commission in 1986. The ICSC and the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (UNJSPB) worked throughout the year on this subject both within their own organizations and in joint consultation. The two bodies had not arrived at a consensus recommendation before the General Assembly; however, members of the Fifth Committee, drawing on the work of both bodies, recommended a new scale of pensionable remuneration which was subsequently adopted. See the discussion about the UN Pension System for additional information.

A subject of equal interest and significance, but one for which there was no final resolution in 1986, is the manner in which the

*Claudia Cooley of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management was a member in 1986.

margin of difference in pay between the United Nations and the comparator, the U.S. Government, is calculated. The calculation of the margin is significant because the results may be used to trigger pay increases throughout the United Nations and specialized agencies. In 1985 the General Assembly agreed to a margin range of 110 to 120 with a desirable level of 115. At the same time, the General Assembly asked the ICSC to study the manner in which the margin is calculated and report its findings in 1986.

At its two sessions in 1986, the Commissioners made several decisions on various steps in the calculation of the margin, but deferred a final overall recommendation pending the results of further analyses. Of particular significance to the United States was the decision, in paragraph 69 of the Report of the International Civil Service Commission (A/41/30), to inform the General Assembly that it agreed, *inter alia*, to the following: “. . . (c) The cost-of-living differential between New York and Washington, D.C. should not be taken into account in the margin calculations; . . .”. The United States strongly supported this decision on the grounds that the comparator, the U.S. Government, does not differentiate in its pay between New York and Washington. However, the decision was controversial and difficult for some members of the Fifth Committee to accept. Accordingly, the ICSC resolution includes language asking the ICSC to review its decision and report back in the next year.

On December 11 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, Resolution 41/207 on the Report of the International Civil Service Commission. In addition to the request to review the calculation of the margin, the resolution included approval of revised scales of staff assessment; reiteration of the U.S.-sponsored request to conduct (and complete by 1987) a study of the mobility of staff; and confirming statements regarding the importance of the Common System of salaries and allowances.

Personnel Questions

The Fifth Committee recommended to the General Assembly the adoption of two resolutions, one of which is a four-part resolution, and three decisions covering the broad topic of “personnel.” All were adopted on December 11 without vote. The first resolution (41/205) deals with privileges and immunities of international civil servants, the second with staffing and employment issues (41/206), and the decisions (41/462, 463, and 464) with the possibility of establishing an ombudsman, status of women in the Secretariat, and staff rules, respectively.

The resolution regarding privileges and immunities does not contain any new provisions, but reiterates the concern for the safety of international civil servants. Member States, organizations, and the Secretary-General are requested to respect the privileges and immunities of international civil servants.

The resolution regarding staffing and employment has four subsections: (A) composition of the Secretariat, (B) composition of the upper echelons of the Secretariat, (C) desirable ranges for the geographical distribution of staff, and (D) improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat. The most controversial issues were B and C.

Regarding the staffing at the upper levels of the organization, the resolution calls upon the Secretary-General to strive to appoint only a national of a country other than that of the incumbent to be replaced in order to reinforce the principle of rotation of posts in upper echelons (Under Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General), unless there are exceptional circumstances. The United States was able to support this resolution as currently written because it allows the Secretary-General some flexibility in his appointments.

There is an allocation system of professional positions for Member States of the United Nations based on three factors: financial contributions, population, and membership. This system is referred to as desirable ranges for the geographical distribution of staff. The current system, which the United States supports, gives the greatest weight to contributions. There has been a steady trend over the years, however, to modify the system by giving greater weight to membership, thereby reducing the staff selection from the larger donor countries. The 1986 resolution is a compromise, which the United States was able to support, because it defers the decision on any significant change in the calculation of desirable ranges. However, this issue will continue to be contentious in the years to come.

UN Pension System

The United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (UNJSPF) was established in 1949 to provide retirement, death, disability, and related benefits for employees of the United Nations and other organizations of the Common System. There are 16 international organizations in the Fund and about 54,000 participants. It is managed by a 21-member UN Joint Staff Pension Board. The Board members are representatives of the governing bodies (Member

States), executive heads of the organizations, and Fund participants. The Fund has assets of approximately \$6 billion.

The Board held its 35th Session in Copenhagen in June and a special session in Geneva in September. The annual report was presented to the General Assembly and considered by the Fifth Committee at nine sessions between November 7 and December 8.

The most significant item before the Board was the determination of a new scale of pensionable remuneration. The level of pensionable remuneration, and thus pensions, had increased at a rate considered to be too high. The International Civil Service Commission and the Pension Board worked on proposals to reduce the level of pensionable remuneration, but could not agree on a single recommendation. During the General Assembly, and after extensive informal consultations among Member States, a revised scale of pensionable remuneration was developed and submitted to the Fifth Committee as a draft resolution. The Fifth Committee accepted the revised and reduced scale, and on December 11 the General Assembly adopted resolution 41/208 without a vote.

In his statement to the Fifth Committee on November 14, Ambassador Joseph Verner Reed stated that:

The U.S. Delegation assesses proposed changes in pay and pensions for staff members of the UN and other organizations of the Common System in light of three overall objectives in compensation policy: (1) equitable, but not excessive, pay and benefits for staff members; (2) simplification of policies so that they can be clearly understood by both staff members and member states; and (3) an appropriate role for member states in decision-making on personnel policy.

The United States, based on its three overall objectives, strongly supported the resolution containing the reduced scale of pensionable remuneration.

The resolution included other components supported by the United States. One is the provision for adjusting the scale of pensionable remuneration based on movements in pay which in turn are tied to movements in pay in the U.S. Government. Another is the provision for ensuring some stability, i.e., the construction of the scale should remain stable for the next 4 years. Finally, the United States supported the resolution for something it did not contain, namely an increase in the rate of contributions by participants and organizations to the fund.

Personnel: Employment Of Americans

Placing qualified Americans in the United Nations remains an important objective for the U.S. Government. United Nations employment of Americans, however, has reached its lowest level since 1981, and the numbers continue to decrease. Furthermore, the United States remains underrepresented throughout most specialized agencies. This is due, in part, to:

- increased efforts by many international organizations both to appoint more nationals from developing countries and to fill new vacancies from within the organization;
- increased emphasis by other nations to place their nationals in these organizations;
- the reluctance of some international organizations to hire additional American candidates;
- the reluctance of many Americans to serve abroad; and
- continuing international organization budgetary constraints which are resulting in hiring freezes or the filling of fewer vacant positions.

At the end of 1986 the UN Secretariat employed a total of 14,225 persons of which 1,729 (12.15 percent) were Americans. In the past year, the Secretariat staff has decreased by 1,467 employees, of which 146 were Americans. In 1981 the United States held 2,049 (12.83 percent) positions out of a total of 15,968. The number of Americans employed by the specialized agencies has decreased more appreciably as described below.

The following table compares the percentage of American employees out of total employees in the UN system for 1981 and 1986. Only in the ILO, IMO, UNRWA, and UNDP have the number of Americans increased during this period.

Americans Employed By The United Nations And Its Specialized Agencies

*(shown as a percentage of total employees)

<i>Organization</i>	<i>1981</i>	<i>1986</i>
<i>Decreases:</i>		
UN Secretariat	12.83	12.15
UNICEF	10.12	6.89
UNHCR	4.02	3.77
UNITAR	32.22	17.50
UNFPA	33.00	20.59
FAO	5.11	4.50
ICAO	16.51	8.08
ITU	4.17	3.37
UPU	1.21	0.47
WIPO	3.50	2.31
WHO	5.08	4.84
WMO	5.36	4.47
IAEA	12.25	9.81
<i>Increases:</i>		
UNRWA	9.52	12.77
UNDP	16.67	17.33
ILO	3.40	4.00
IMO	1.02	1.92

The United States remains seriously underrepresented on the staffs of most of the specialized agencies. In order to assure broad geographic representation in their secretariats, the UN Secretariat and some of the larger specialized agencies allocate certain professional level posts according to a geographic distribution formula and fix desirable ranges for employment from each member nation. As the following table shows, the United States falls below its desirable range in all of the organizations except the United Nations itself.

Personnel Subject To Geographic Distribution

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total U.S.</i>	<i>Desirable Ranges</i>
UN Secretariat	2,654	425	406-549
FAO	850	75	153-212
ICAO	242	22	49
ILO	640	59	112-150
WHO	982	126	199-270
WIPO	82	3	6-8
IAEA	590	95	125-209

Although FAO normally states its desirable range as a percent of total staff, it has been given here as a number for uniformity of presentation. WIPO has established a desirable range for "North America," which includes Canada as well as the United States.

IMO and WMO have also identified posts subject to geographic distribution, but because their secretariats are small, they have not established desirable ranges. The United States is assessed 4.96 Percent of IMO's budget and Americans hold 4.76 percent of IMO professional posts. However, the United States is seriously underrepresented in WMO where Americans hold only 8.14 percent of the posts while being assessed 24.51 percent of the budget.

APPENDIX 1

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT REAGAN AT THE 41ST REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*Statement before the 41st Session
of the UN General Assembly on Sep-
tember 22, 1986*

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, honored guests, and distinguished delegates, a short walk from this chamber is the delegates' Meditation Room, a refuge from a world deafened by the noise of strife and violence. "We want to bring back the idea of worship," Dag Hammarskjöld once said about this room, "devotion to something which is greater and higher than we are ourselves."

It is just such devotion that gave birth to the United Nations: devotion to the dream of world peace and freedom, of human rights and democratic self-determination, of a time when, in those ancient words, "... and they shall beat their swords into plowshares ... nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

The United States remains committed to the United Nations. For over 40 years, this organization has provided an international forum for harmonizing conflicting national interests and has made a significant contribution in such fields as peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and eradicating disease. Yet, no one knows better than those in this chamber how the noble ideals embodied in the Charter have often remained unfulfilled. This organization itself faces a critical hour—that is usually stated as a fiscal crisis. But we can turn this "crisis" into an opportunity. The important reforms proposed by the Group of Experts can be a first step toward restoring the organization's status and effectiveness.

The issue, ultimately, is not one of cash but of credibility. If all the members of this universal organization decide to seize the moment and turn the rhetoric of reform into reality, the future of the United Nations will be secure. And you have my word for it: My country, which has always given the United Nations generous support, will continue to play a leading role in the effort to achieve its noble purposes.

When I came before you last year, an important moment in the pursuit of those purposes had not yet occurred. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States were to meet in Geneva. These discussions have now been held. For over 15 hours, the Soviet and American Delegations met. For about 5 hours, General Secretary Gorbachev and I talked alone.

Our talks were frank. The talks were also productive—in a larger sense than even the documents that were agreed. Mr. Gorbachev was blunt; so was I. We came to realize again the truth of the statement: Nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. And I did not hesitate to tell Mr. Gorbachev our view of the source of that mistrust: the Soviet Union's record of seeking to impose its ideology and rule on others. So, we acknowledged the deep and abiding differences between our systems of government, our views of history, and the future of mankind. But, despite these differences, we resolved to work together for real reductions in nuclear arms, as well as progress in other areas.

Delegates to the 41st General Assembly of the United Nations, today I want to report to you on what has transpired since the summit; notably the important letter I sent July 25th to Mr. Gorbachev. In that letter, I dealt with the important issues of reducing nuclear arms, agreeing on strategic defenses, and limiting nuclear testing. In addition to those issues, which concern the military aspects of Soviet-American relations, I would also like to address other essential steps toward peace; the resolutions of political conflicts, the strengthening of the international economy, and the protection of human rights.

Before I do this, however, let me, in the tradition of candor established at Geneva, tell you that a pall has been cast over our relations with the Soviet Union. I refer here to a particularly disturbing example of Soviet transgressions against human rights.

Recently—after the arrest of a Soviet national and U.N. employee accused of espionage in the United States—an American correspondent in Moscow was made the subject of fabricated accusations and trumped-up charges. He was arrested and jailed in a callous disregard of due process and numerous human rights conventions. In effect, he was taken as a hostage—even threatened with the death penalty.

Both individuals have now been remanded to their respective ambassadors. But this is only an interim step, agreed to by the United States for humanitarian reasons. It does not change the facts of the case: Gennadi Zakharov is an accused spy who should stand trial; Nicholas Daniloff is an innocent hostage who should be released. The Soviet Union bears the responsibility for the consequences of its action. Misusing the United Nations for the purposes of espionage does a grave disservice to this organization.

The world expects better. It expects contributions to the cause of peace that only the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can make.

It is for this reason that I wrote last summer to Mr. Gorbachev with new arms control proposals. Before discussing the proposals, let us be clear

about which weapons are the most dangerous and threatening to peace. The threat does not come from defensive systems, which are a shield against attack; but from offensive weapons—ballistic missiles that hurtle through space and can wreak mass destruction on the surface of the Earth—especially the Soviet Union's heavy, accurate ICBMs, with multiple warheads, which have no counterparts in size or number in any other country.

That is why the United States has long urged radical, equitable, verifiable reductions in these offensive systems. Note that I said reduction; for this is the real purpose of arms control: not just to codify the levels of today's arsenals, not just to channel their further expansion, but to reduce them, in ways that will reduce the danger of war. Indeed, the United States believes the prospect of a future without such weapons of mass destruction must be the ultimate goal of arms control.

I am pleased to say that the Soviet Union has now embraced our idea of radical reductions in offensive systems. At the Geneva summit last November, we agreed to intensify work in this area. Since then, the Soviets have made detailed proposals which, while not acceptable to us, appear to represent a serious effort. So, we continue to seek a 50% reduction of American and Soviet arsenals—with the central focus on the reduction of ballistic missile warheads. If the Soviet Union wants only a lesser reduction, however, we are prepared to consider it but as an interim measure. In other provisions as well, we have sought to take account of Soviet concerns. So there has been movement.

Similarly, in the area of intermediate-range nuclear forces, the United States seeks the total elimination of such missiles on a global basis. Again, if the Soviet Union insists on pursuing such a goal in stages, we are prepared to conclude an interim agreement without delay.

All this gives me hope. I can tell you the exchanges between our two sides this summer could well have marked the beginning of a serious, productive negotiation on arms reduc-

tions. The ice of the negotiating stalemate could break—if both sides intensify their effort in the new round of Geneva talks and if we keep the promises we made to each other last November.

For too long a time, however, the Soviet response has been to downplay the need for offensive reductions. When the United States began work on the technology to make offensive nuclear weapons someday obsolete, the Soviets tried to make that the main issue—as if the main danger to strategic stability was a defense against missiles that is still on the drawing boards, rather than the menacing ballistic missiles themselves that already exist in excessive numbers.

Still, the United States recognizes that both the offensive and defensive sides of the strategic equation must be addressed. And we have gone far to meet Soviet concerns expressed about the potential offensive use of strategic defensive systems. I have offered firm and concrete assurances that our SDI could never be used to deploy weapons in space that can cause mass destruction on Earth. I have pointed out that the radical reduction we seek now in offensive arsenals would be additional insurance that SDI cannot be used to support a first-strike strategy. And our preference—from the beginning—has been to move forward cooperatively with the Soviets on strategic defenses, so the neither side will feel threatened and both can benefit from the strategic revolution SDI represents.

The United States continues to respect the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty—in spite of clear evidence the Soviets are violating it. We have told the Soviets that if we can both agree on radical reductions in strategic offensive weapons, we are prepared—right now—to sign an agreement with them on research, development, testing, and deployment of strategic defenses based on the following:

First, both sides would agree to confine themselves, through 1991, to research, development, and testing, which is permitted by the ABM Treaty, to determine whether advanced systems of strategic defense are technically feasible.

Second, a new treaty, signed now, would provide that if, after 1991, either side should decide to deploy such a system, that side would be obliged to offer a plan for sharing the benefits of strategic defense and for eliminating offensive ballistic missiles. This plan would be negotiated over a 2-year period.

Third, if the two sides can't agree after 2 years of negotiation, either side would be free to deploy an advanced strategic defensive system, after giving 6 months' notice to the other.

As the United States has repeatedly made clear, we are moving toward a future of greater reliance upon strategic defense. The United States remains prepared to talk about how—under what ground rules and process—we and the Soviet Union can do this cooperatively. Such strategic defense, coupled with radical reductions in offensive forces, would represent a safer balance and would give future statesmen the opportunity to move beyond it—to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

In addition to our proposals on offensive reductions and strategic defense, we have suggested new steps in another area: nuclear testing. Just as eliminating all nuclear weapons is our long-term goal, so too is a total ban on nuclear testing. But both must be approached with practical steps. For the reality is that for now we still must rely on these weapons for the deterrence of war; thus the safety and reliability of our deterrent are themselves critical to peace.

The United States is proud of its record of nuclear safety and intends to maintain it.

Nevertheless, we are, as I said, ready now to take two important steps toward limiting nuclear testing: First, we are ready to move forward on ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions, once agreement is reached on improved verification procedures. We have proposed new ideas to make this possible.

Second, upon ratification of those treaties—and in association with a program to reduce and ultimately elimi-

nate all nuclear weapons—we are prepared to discuss ways to implement a step-by-step parallel program of limiting and ultimately ending nuclear testing.

These are steps we could take in the near future, to show the world we are moving forward. I therefore call upon the Soviet Union to join us in practical, attainable progress in limiting nuclear testing.

Just a few days ago, I received a reply from General Secretary Gorbachev to my letter of July 25. And, for the moment, let me simply say we are giving it serious and careful consideration.

As we move toward our goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, it is vital that we also address important imbalances in other kinds of weapons. This is why the United States has proposed a comprehensive global ban on all chemical weapons, and why we and our allies have tried hard to break the stalemate in the conventional force negotiations in Vienna. And in the Stockholm Conference, a major advance has been achieved: a concrete new set of military confidence-building measures which includes inspections.

But we must remember from the experience of the 1970's that progress in arms control cannot be divorced from regional political developments. As I said at the beginning, political tensions cause the military competition, not the other way around.

But, while the United States and the Soviet Union disagree over the root causes of political tension, we do agree that regional conflicts could escalate into global confrontation. Last year from this rostrum, I presented a formula for peace which would apply to five critical, regional conflicts that are potential flashpoints for wider conflict. I pointed out how difficult it is for the United States to accept Soviet assurances of peaceful intent when 126,000 Soviet troops prosecute a vicious war against the Afghan people; when 140,000 Soviet-backed Vietnamese soldiers wage war on the people of Cambodia; when 1,700 Soviet advisors and 2,500 Cuban combat troops are involved in military planning and operations in Ethiopia; when 1,300 Soviet military advisors and 36,000 Cuban

troops direct and participate in combat operations to prop up an unpopular, repressive regime in Angola; when hundreds of millions of dollars in Soviet arms and Soviet-bloc advisors help a dictatorial regime in Nicaragua try to subvert its neighbors and betray a popular revolution.

The danger inherent in these conflicts must be recognized. Marxist-Leninist regimes tend to wage war as readily against their neighbors as they routinely do against their own people. In fact, the internal and external wars often become indistinguishable. In Afghanistan, for example, the puppet regime has announced its intention to relocate tens of thousands of people from border areas. Can anyone doubt this will be done in classic Communist style—by force? Many will die, to make it easier for the Soviets and their satellite troops to intimidate Pakistan.

It is just such transgressions that make the risk of confrontation with democratic nations so acute.

So, once again, I propose a three-point peace process for the resolution of regional conflicts: first, talks between the warring parties themselves, without which an end to violence and national reconciliation are impossible; second, discussions between the United States and Soviet Union—not to impose solutions, but to support peace talks and eventually eliminate the supply of arms and the proxy troops from abroad. And third, if the talks are successful, joint efforts to welcome each country back into the world economy and the community of nations that respect human rights.

In addition to regional disputes, the grave threat of terrorism also jeopardizes the hopes for peace. No cause, no grievance can justify it. Terrorism is heinous and intolerable. It is the crime of cowards—cowards who prey on the innocent, the defenseless, the helpless.

With its allies and other nations, the United States has taken steps to counter terrorism directly—particularly state-sponsored terrorism. Last April, the United States demonstrated that it will defend its interests and act against terrorist aggression. Let me assure all of you today, especially let

me assure any potential sponsors of terrorism, that the American people are of one mind on this issue. Like other civilized peoples of the world, we have reached our limit. Attacks against our citizens or our interests will not go unanswered.

We will also do all in our power to help other law-abiding nations threatened by terrorist attacks. To that end, the United States believes that the understandings reached by the seven industrial democracies at the Tokyo summit last May made a good start toward international accord in the war on terrorism. We recommend to the General Assembly consideration of the Tokyo resolutions.

Moving to the economic realm, how ironic it is that some continue to espouse such ideas as a "new international economic order" based on state control when the world is learning, as never before, that the freedom of the individual, not the power of state, is the key to economic dynamism and growth. Nations have turned away from centralized management and government controls and towards the incentives and rewards of the free market. They have invited their citizens to develop their talents and abilities to the fullest and, in the process, to provide jobs, to create wealth, to build social stability and foster faith in the future for all. The economic summits of the industrial democracies have paid tribute to these principles—as has the historic U.N. Special Session on Africa in May. We applaud the African nations' call for reform leading to greater reliance on their private sectors for economic growth. We believe that overcoming hunger and economic stagnation requires policies that encourage Africa's own productivity and initiative; such a policy framework will make it easier for the rest of the world, including the United States, to help. The laws of economic incentives do not discriminate between developed and developing. They apply to all equally.

Much of the recent recovery in the world economy can be directly attributed to this growth of economic freedom. And it is this trend that offers such hope for the future. Yet this new hope faces a grave threat: the

menace of trade barriers. History shows the imposition of such barriers invites retaliation, retaliation which in turn sparks the very sort of trade wars that plunged the world in the 1930's deeper into depression and economic misery. Truly, protectionism is destructionism.

That is why the United States seeks the assistance of all countries represented in the General Assembly in protecting the practice of free and fair trade. We applaud the success of the meeting of GATT trade ministers last week in Uruguay, where agreement was reached to launch a new round of multilateral trade negotiations covering a wide range of topics important to economic growth. With over 90 other countries of the GATT, the United States is working to maintain the free flow of international trade.

In addition to resistance to protectionism, the United States is also seeking to stimulate world economic growth in other ways. Our Treasury bill interest rate is now just over 5 percent, the lowest it has been in 9 years—which provides enormous relief to debtor countries. America's new tax structure will open the way for greater prosperity at home, which will contribute to greater prosperity abroad. Finally, the United States is working with other countries to minimize currency swings, to promote stability in the monetary markets, to establish predictability as a basis for prosperity.

But, the United States believes the greatest contribution we can make to world prosperity is the continued advocacy of the magic of the marketplace—the truth, the simple and proven truth, that economic development is an outgrowth of economic freedom just as economic freedom is the inseparable twin of political freedom and democratic government.

And it is here that we come to our final category—human rights—the indispensable element for peace, freedom, and prosperity. I note that Mr. Gorbachev has used in recent speeches the same categories I have used here today: the military, the political, and the economic; except that he titled his fourth category: humanitarian.

The difference is revealing. The United States believes that respect for the individual, for the dignity of the human person—those rights outlined in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights—does not belong in the realm of charity or “humanitarian” causes. Respect for human rights is not social work; it is not merely an act of compassion. It is the first obligation of government and the source of its legitimacy.

It also is the foundation stone in any structure of world peace. All through history, it has been the dictatorships and the tyrannies that have surrendered first to the cult of militarism and the pursuit of war. Countries based on the consent of the governed, countries that recognize the unalienable rights of the individual, do not make war on each other. Peace is more than just the absence of war. True peace is justice, true peace is freedom. And true peace dictates the recognition of human rights.

Commitments were made more than 10 years ago in Helsinki concerning these rights and their recognition. We need only look to the East today to see how sadly unfulfilled those commitments are. The persecution of scientists, religious leaders, peace activists, political dissenters, and other prisoners of conscience continues unabated behind the Iron Curtain. You know, one section of the Helsinki accords even speaks to—and I quote—“improvement of working conditions of journalists.”

So, it is clear that progress in the human rights area must keep pace with progress in other areas. A failure on this score will hinder further movement in East-West relations.

These, then, are the areas of concern and of opportunity that the United States sees in the quest for peace and freedom—the twin objectives of the UN Charter.

Last year, I pointed out in my address to the General Assembly the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding. But I also called for a fresh start in relations between our two nations, a fresh start that could benefit our own people and the people of every nation. Since that time, the United

States has taken action and put forth new proposals that could lead our two countries and the entire world in a direction we all have long sought to go. Now more than ever, it is the responsibility of the Soviet Union to take action and demonstrate that they too are continuing the dialogue for peace.

As I have said, I believe we can be hopeful about the world and the prospects for freedom. We need only look around us to see the new technologies that may someday spare future generations the nightmare of nuclear terror, or the growing ranks of democratic activists and freedom fighters, or the increasing movement toward free market economies, to the extent of worldwide concern about the rights of the individual in the face of brute, state power.

In the past, when I have noted such trend—when I have called for a “forward strategy for freedom” and predicted the ultimate triumph of democratic rule over totalitarianism—some have accused me of telling people what they want to hear, of urging them not to engage the day but to escape it.

Yet, to hope is to believe in humanity; and in its future. Hope remains the highest reality, the age-old power; hope is at the root of all the great ideas and causes that have bettered the lot of humankind across the centuries.

History teaches us to hope—for it teaches us about man, and about the irrepressible human spirit. A Nobel Laureate in literature, a great figure of the American South, William Faulkner, once said that the last sound heard on Earth would be that of the two remaining humans arguing over where to go in the spaceship they had built. In his speech to the Nobel committee in 1950, Faulkner spoke of the nuclear age, of the general and universal physical fear it had engendered, a fear of destruction that had become almost unbearable. But, he said, “I decline to accept the end of a man. I believe that man will not merely endure: he will prevail. He is immortal . . . because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance.”

Faulkner spoke of "the old verities and truths of the heart," of the courage, honor, pride, compassion, pity, sacrifice and, yes, that hope which is the glory of our past. And all of these things we find today in our present; we must use them to build our future. It is why today we can lift up our spirits

and our hearts; it is why we resolve that with God's help the cause of humanity will not merely "endure but prevail"; that someday all the world—every nation, every people, every person—will know the blessings of peace and see the light of freedom.

APPENDIX 2

Principal Organs of the United Nations

General Assembly

The General Assembly is composed of all 159 members. They are:

Member	Date of Admission	Member	Date of Admission
Afghanistan	Nov. 19, 1946	Chad	Sept. 20, 1960
Albania	Dec. 14, 1955	Chile	Oct. 24, 1945
Algeria	Oct. 8, 1962	China*	Oct. 24, 1945
Angola	Dec. 1, 1976	Colombia	Nov. 5, 1945
Antigua and Barbuda	Nov. 11, 1981	Comoros	Nov. 12, 1975
Argentina	Oct. 24, 1945	Congo	Sept. 20, 1960
Australia	Nov. 1, 1945	Costa Rica	Nov. 2, 1945
Austria	Dec. 14, 1955	Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)	Sept. 20, 1960
Bahamas	Sept. 18, 1973	Cuba	Oct. 24, 1945
Bahrain	Sept. 21, 1971	Cyprus	Sept. 20, 1960
Bangladesh	Sept. 17, 1974	Czechoslovakia	Oct. 24, 1945
Barbados	Dec. 9, 1966	Denmark	Oct. 24, 1945
Belgium	Dec. 27, 1945	Djibouti	Sept. 20, 1977
Belize	Sept. 25, 1981	Dominica	Dec. 18, 1978
Benin	Sept. 20, 1960	Dominican Republic	Oct. 24, 1945
Bhutan	Sept. 21, 1971	Ecuador	Dec. 21, 1945
Bolivia	Nov. 14, 1945	Egypt	Oct. 24, 1945
Botswana	Oct. 17, 1966	El Salvador	Oct. 24, 1945
Brazil	Oct. 24, 1945	Equatorial Guinea	Nov. 12, 1968
Brunei Darussalam	Sept. 21, 1984	Ethiopia	Nov. 13, 1945
Bulgaria	Dec. 14, 1955	Fiji	Oct. 13, 1970
Burkina Faso	Sept. 20, 1960	Finland	Dec. 14, 1955
Burma	Apr. 19, 1948	France	Oct. 24, 1945
Burundi	Sept. 18, 1962	Gabon	Sept. 20, 1960
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945	Gambia	Sept. 21, 1965
Cameroon	Sept. 20, 1960	German Democratic Republic	Sept. 18, 1973
Canada	Nov. 9, 1945	Germany, Federal Republic of	Sept. 18, 1973
Cape Verde	Sept. 16, 1975	Ghana	Mar. 8, 1957
Central African Republic	Sept. 20, 1960		

*By resolution 2758 (XXVI) of October 25, 1971, the General Assembly decided "to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations."

Member	Date of Admission	Member	Date of Admission
Greece	Oct. 25, 1945	Peru	Oct. 31, 1945
Grenada	Sept. 17, 1974	Philippines	Oct. 24, 1945
Guatemala	Nov. 21, 1945	Poland	Oct. 24, 1945
Guinea	Dec. 12, 1958	Portugal	Dec. 14, 1955
Guinea-Bissau	Sept. 17, 1974	Qatar	Sept. 21, 1971
Guyana	Sept. 20, 1966	Romania	Dec. 14, 1955
Haiti	Oct. 24, 1945	Rwanda	Sept. 18, 1962
Honduras	Dec. 17, 1945	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Sept. 23, 1983
Hungary	Dec. 14, 1955	Saint Lucia	Sept. 18, 1979
Iceland	Nov. 19, 1946	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Sept. 16, 1980
India	Oct. 30, 1945		
Indonesia	Sept. 28, 1950	Samoa	Dec. 15, 1976
Iran	Oct. 24, 1945	Sao Tome and Principe	Sept. 16, 1975
Iraq	Dec. 21, 1945		
Ireland	Dec. 14, 1955	Saudi Arabia	Oct. 24, 1945
Israel	May 11, 1949	Senegal	Sept. 28, 1960
Italy	Dec. 14, 1955	Seychelles	Sept. 21, 1976
Jamaica	Sept. 18, 1962	Sierra Leone	Sept. 27, 1961
Japan	Dec. 18, 1956	Singapore	Sept. 21, 1965
Jordan	Dec. 14, 1955	Solomon Islands	Sept. 19, 1978
Kampuchea	Dec. 14, 1955	Somalia	Sept. 20, 1960
Kenya	Dec. 16, 1963	South Africa	Nov. 7, 1945
Kuwait	May 14, 1963	Spain	Dec. 14, 1955
Laos	Dec. 14, 1955	Sri Lanka	Dec. 14, 1955
Lebanon	Oct. 24, 1945	Sudan	Nov. 12, 1956
Lesotho	Oct. 17, 1966	Suriname	Dec. 4, 1975
Liberia	Nov. 2, 1945	Swaziland	Sept. 24, 1968
Libya	Dec. 14, 1955	Sweden	Nov. 19, 1946
Luxembourg	Oct. 24, 1945	Syria	Oct. 24, 1945
Madagascar	Sept. 20, 1960	Tanzania	Dec. 14, 1961
Malawi	Dec. 1, 1964	Thailand	Dec. 16, 1946
Malaysia	Sept. 17, 1957	Togo	Sept. 20, 1960
Maldives	Sept. 21, 1965	Trinidad and Tobago	Sept. 18, 1962
Mali	Sept. 28, 1960	Tunisia	Nov. 12, 1956
Malta	Dec. 1, 1964	Turkey	Oct. 24, 1945
Mauritania	Oct. 27, 1961	Uganda	Oct. 25, 1962
Mauritius	Apr. 24, 1968	Ukrainian S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945
Mexico	Nov. 7, 1945	U.S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945
Mongolia	Oct. 27, 1961	United Arab Emirates	Dec. 9, 1971
Morocco	Nov. 12, 1956	United Kingdom	Oct. 24, 1945
Mozambique	Sept. 16, 1975	United States	Oct. 24, 1945
Nepal	Dec. 14, 1955	Uruguay	Dec. 18, 1945
Netherlands	Dec. 10, 1945	Vanuatu	Sept. 15, 1981
New Zealand	Oct. 24, 1945	Venezuela	Nov. 15, 1945
Nicaragua	Oct. 24, 1945	Vietnam	Sept. 20, 1977
Niger	Sept. 20, 1960	Yemen (Aden)	Dec. 14, 1967
Nigeria	Oct. 7, 1960	Yemen (Sanaa)	Sept. 30, 1947
Norway	Nov. 27, 1945	Yugoslavia	Oct. 24, 1945
Oman	Oct. 7, 1971	Zaire	Sept. 20, 1960
Pakistan	Sept. 30, 1947	Zambia	Dec. 1, 1964
Panama	Nov. 13, 1945	Zimbabwe	Aug. 25, 1980
Papua New Guinea	Oct. 10, 1975		
Paraguay	Oct. 24, 1945		

The 40th regular session, which was suspended December 18, 1985, was resumed April 28–June 20, 1986, to consider 13 items remaining on the agenda (Decision 40/470) and the current financial crisis of the United Nations. In addition, the General Assembly held two special sessions in 1986. The thirteenth special session was convened (May 27–June 1) to consider the critical economic situation in Africa and the fourteenth special session was convened (September 17–20) to discuss the question of Namibia.

The 41st regular session of the General Assembly convened September 16 and was suspended December 19, 1986.

The Assembly elected Humayun Rasheed Choudhury (Bangladesh) as President and the Chairmen of the Delegations of Benin, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Fiji, France, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Oman, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, U.S.S.R, the United Kingdom and the United States as the 21 Vice Presidents.

The Chairmen of the seven main committees, on which each member may be represented, were:

First Committee (Political and Security) — Siegfried Zachmann (German Democratic Republic)

Special Political Committee — Kwam Kouassi (Togo)

Second Committee (Economic and Financial) — Abdalla Saleh Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen)

Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural) — Alphons C. M. Hamer (Netherlands)

Fourth Committee (Decolonization) — James Victor Gbeho (Ghana)

Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) — Even Fontaine Ortiz (Cuba)

Sixth Committee (Legal) — Laurel B. Francis (Jamaica)

The General Committee (steering committee) is composed of the President, the 21 Vice Presidents, and Chairmen of the Seven Committees.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council is composed of 5 members designated in the Charter as permanent and 10 members elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

Permanent Members: China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

1986: Australia, Denmark, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago.

1987: Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela.

On October 16, 1986, the Assembly elected Argentina, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan and Zambia as members of the Security Council for a 2-year term of office beginning January 1, 1987.

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

The Trusteeship Council is composed of the United States (as administrator of a territory), and the other four permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom).

The Trusteeship Council held its 53d meeting in New York, May 12 to June 30, and two special sessions in 1986. The 16th special session was held at UN Headquarters, February 4-6, to consider the dispatch of a mission to observe a plebiscite in Palau on the Compact of Free Association. The 17th special session was held in New York, November 20-26, on the same subject.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

ECOSOC is composed of 54 members elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

1986: Argentina, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Finland, Guyana, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

1987: Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Japan, Morocco, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Turkey, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

1988: Australia, Belgium, Byelorussia S.S.R., Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Mozambique, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, the United States.

On October 16, 1986, the Assembly elected Belize, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Iran, Norway, Oman, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Uruguay and Zaire for terms beginning on January 1, 1987.

ECOSOC held its organizational session for 1986 (February 4-7) and its first regular session (April 29-May 23) in New York. The second regular session of 1986 was held in Geneva (July 2-25).

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice consists of fifteen members elected by the General Assembly and Security Council for 9-year terms ending February 5 of the year given in parenthesis. The Judges, listed in their order of precedence, are:

Nagendra Singh of India (1991), President
Guy Ladreit de Lacharriere of France (1991), Vice President
Manfred Lachs of Poland (1994)
Jose Maria Ruda of Argentina (1991)
Taslim Olawale Elias of Nigeria (1994)
Shigeru Oda of Japan (1994)
Roberto Ago of Italy (1988)
Jose Sette-Camara of Brazil (1988)
Stephen Schwebel of the United States (1988)
Robert Y. Jennings of the United Kingdom (1991)
Keba Mbaye of Senegal (1991)
Mohammed Bedjaoui of Algeria (1988)
Ni Zhengyu of China (1994)
Jens Evensen of Norway (1994)
Nikolai Konstantinovich Tarasov of the U.S.S.R. (1988)

APPENDIX 3

United States Missions

U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK

The United States is represented by a permanent mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. Under the direction of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, the mission carries out the instructions of the President, as transmitted by the Secretary of State. It serves as the channel of communications between the U.S. Government and the UN organs, agencies, and commissions at the Headquarters; with the 158 other permanent missions accredited to the United Nations; and with various nonmember observer missions. It is also a base of operations for the U.S. Delegations to the General Assembly and to other UN bodies when they meet in New York.

The chief of mission, who has the rank of Ambassador, is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and also represents the United States in the Security Council. He or she is assisted by other persons of appropriate title, rank, and status, who are appointed by the President.

The mission has a staff including specialists in political, economic, social, financial, budgetary, legal, military, public affairs, and administrative matters. In 1986 about 140 persons were assigned to the mission by the Department of State and other U.S. Departments and Agencies.

The staff assists the U.S. Representative in such activities as (1) planning the tactical pursuit of U.S. policy objectives in UN organs and bodies; (2) carrying out consultations, negotiation, and liaison with other delegations and the UN Secretariat; (3) preparing policy recommendations to the Department of State; (4) reporting to the Department of State on consultations and developments in the United Nations; (5) discharging U.S. responsibilities as "host government"—in particular those arising from the 1947 Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.); the International Organizations Immunities Act of 1945, as amended; and the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, which deal, *inter alia*, with relations of the United Nations, its of-

ficials, and delegation members with Federal, State, and local authorities; (6) carrying out public affairs activities; and (7) planning and administering conference operations.

U.S. MISSION TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GENEVA

The United States maintains a permanent mission in Geneva under the direction of a U.S. Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, who is accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and to the UN specialized agencies and other international organizations with headquarters in Geneva. The mission is responsible for the representation of U.S. interests at the UN European headquarters, in UN subsidiary bodies located in Geneva (such as UNCTAD, UNHCR, ECE, and the UN Disaster Relief Office); in the four specialized agencies which have their headquarters in Geneva (WHO, WMO, ITU, and WIPO); and in other international bodies such as GATT, CD, and the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration. The mission also maintains liaison, as appropriate, with resident delegations of other nations in Geneva, as well as with a large number of nongovernmental or voluntary organizations involved in humanitarian affairs, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The mission maintains liaison on a continuing basis with the executive heads and members of secretariats of international bodies, reports on developments relating to them, monitors their programs and budgets, and makes policy and program recommendations to the Department of State.

The mission staff includes economic, political, financial, budgetary, scientific, agricultural, health, public affairs, humanitarian, and administrative advisers. In 1986 about 135 Americans, including personnel detailed by U.S. Government Departments other than the Department of State, were assigned to the staff, and 50 local employees were hired full time.

The Ambassador often heads or serves as alternate on delegations to large conferences, and other officers of the mission either represent the United States in smaller international meetings or serve on the U.S. Delegations to these.

OTHER U.S. MISSIONS

The United States also maintains a mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations and IAEA in Vienna, an observer mission to UNESCO in Paris, a mission to the UN Agencies for Food and Agriculture in Rome, a mission to ICAO in Montreal, and a liaison office with UNEP in Nairobi.

APPENDIX 4

United States Representatives

Permanent Representative and Chief of Mission to the United Nations: Vernon A. Walters

Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations: Herbert S. Okun

Deputy Permanent Representative to the Security Council: Patricia M. Byrne

Representative on the Economic and Social Council: Joseph Verner Reed

Alternate Permanent Representative for Special Political Affairs: Hugh Montgomery

Representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations: Gerald P. Carmen (through August 31. Vacant from September 1)

U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Vienna: Bruce K. Chapman

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

13th special session (New York, May 27-June 1)

Representatives: Vernon A. Walters (Chairman); Herbert S. Okun
Alternates: Gerald P. Carmen; Chester A. Crocker; Mark Edelman; Alan L. Keyes; M. Peter McPherson; Joseph V. Reed; Loret Ruppe; Allen Wallis

14th special session (New York, September 17-20)

Representatives: same as for the thirteenth special session.

41st regular session (New York, Sept. 16-Dec. 19)

Representatives: Vernon A. Walters (Chairman); Herbert S. Okun (Vice-Chairman); Thomas F. Eagleton; Larry Pressler; Helen Marie Taylor.

Alternates: Paul S. Tribble, Jr.; John F. Kerry; Patricia M. Byrne; Joseph Verner Reed; Hugh Montgomery; Joan Clark; Noel E. Gross

Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation

35th session (Vienna, June 14-18)

Representative: Robert D. Moseley

Alternate: John H. Harley

Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

29th session (New York, June 2-13)

Representative: Herbert S. Okun

Alternate: Otho E. Eskin

Conference on Disarmament

(Geneva, Feb. 4-Apr. 29)

Representative: Donald S. Lowitz

Alternate: Thomas F. Barthelemy

(Geneva, June 9-Aug. 29)

Representative: Donald S. Lowitz

Alternate: Thomas F. Barthelemy

Disarmament Commission

(New York, May 5-23)

Representative: Herbert S. Okun

Alternate: Donald S. Lowitz

UN Conference on Trade and Development

Did not meet in 1986

Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD

32d session (Geneva, Mar. 10-21, June 16-17)

Representative: Gerald P. Carmen

Alternate: Dennis Goodman

33d session (Geneva, Sept. 1-10)

Representative: Ronald D. Flack

Alternates: Dennis Goodman; Jon Rosenbaum

Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations

Did not meet in 1986

UN Commission on International Trade Law

19th session (New York, June 23-July 11)

Representative: Peter H. Pfund

Alternate: John A. Spanogle, Jr.

Governing Council of UNEP

Did not meet in 1986

*Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations
and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization*

(New York, April 7-May 2)

Representative: Robert Rosenstock

Alternates: Neal Waldrop; David Ettinger

Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean

(New York, Mar. 24-Apr. 4)

Representative: David W. Loving

Alternate: Richard L. Horne

Committee on Conferences

Did not meet in 1986.

Committee on Information

(New York, Mar. 17-18)

Representative: Richard Hottlet

Alternate: Kenneth Jarrett

(New York, June 23–July 7)
Representatives: Richard Hottlelet
Alternates: Rose S. Bernstein; Kenneth Jarrett

World Food Council

12th session (Rome, June 16–19)
Representative: Richard E. Lyng
Alternate: Daniel G. Amstutz

*Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness
of the Non-Use of Force in International Relations*
(New York, Jan. 20–Feb. 14)

Representative: Robert Rosenstock
Alternate: Neal Waldrop

*Ad Hoc Committee on Drafting an International Convention
Against Activities of Mercenaries*
(New York, Jan. 19–Feb. 6)

Representative: Carolyn Willson
Alternate: Robert Rosenstock

*Preparatory Committee for the UN Conference on Peaceful
Use of Nuclear Energy*

7th session (Vienna, Nov. 10–21)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Bruce K. Chapman
Representative: Lewis A. Dunn
Alternates: Wilfred F. Declercq; Carlton R. Stoiber

*Conference on the Law of Treaties Between States and
International Organizations or Between International Organi-
zations*

(Vienna, Feb. 18–Mar. 21)
Representative: Robert E. Dalton
Alternate: Robert B. Rosenstock

*Committee on the Development and Utilization of New
and Renewable Sources of Energy*

3rd session (New York, June 9–13)
Representative: James Ferrer, Jr.
Alternates: Jack P. Orlando; Kyle R. Scott

SECURITY COUNCIL

Representative: Vernon A. Walters
Deputies: Herbert S. Okun; Patricia M. Byrne
Alternate: Robert M. Immerman

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

53d session (New York, May 12–June 30)
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Robert M. Immerman; Jeffrey A. Bader;
Robert Rosenstock

16th special session (New York, Feb. 4-6)

17th special session (New York, Nov. 20-26)

Representative: Patricia M. Byrne

Alternates: Robert M. Immerman; Jeffrey J. Buczacki;

Robert Rosenstock

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Organizational session for 1986 (New York, Feb. 4-7)

Representative: Joseph Verner Reed

Alternate: James Ferrer, Jr.

1st regular session, 1986 (New York) Apr. 29-May 23)

Representative: Patricia M. Byrne

Alternates: James Ferrer, Jr.; W. Lewis Amselem

2d regular session, 1986 (Geneva, July 2-23)

Representative: Joseph Verner Reed

Alternates: Gerald P. Carmen; James Ferrer, Jr.

Commission on Human Rights

42d session (Geneva, Feb. 3-Mar. 14)

Representative: Richard Schifter

Alternates: Gerald P. Carmen; Patricia M. Byrne; Laura Genero; Warren E. Hewitt; Robert Wallach

Commission on Narcotic Drugs

9th special session (Vienna, Feb. 10-21)

Representative: Jon R. Thomas

Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

Population Commission

Did not meet in 1986

Commission for Social Development

Did not meet in 1986

Statistical Commission

Did not meet in 1986

Commission on Status of Women

31st session (Vienna, Feb. 24-Mar. 5)

Representative: Maureen Reagan

Alternates: Cecile Fox; Nancy Risque

Commission on Transnational Corporations

Resumed special session (New York, Jan. 20-31)

Representative: William B. Milam

Alternate: Clarke N. Ellis

12th session (New York, Apr. 9-18)

Representative: Seymour J. Rubin

Alternate: Walter B. Lockwood

Economic Commission for Europe

41st plenary (Geneva, Apr. 15-26)

Representative: Gerald P. Carmen

Alternates: Dennis Goodman; Bernard Engel

Economic Commission for Asia and the Pacific

42d plenary (Bangkok, Apr. 22–May 2)

Representative: Dennis Goodman

Alternates: William A. Brown; Paul Stahnke

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

21st plenary (Mexico City, Apr. 17–25)

Representative: Alan L. Keyes

Alternate: Thomas T. Turgman

Executive Board of UNICEF

(New York, Apr. 14–25)

Representative: Rita Di Martino

Alternate: Claudine B. Cox

Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

Did not meet in 1986

Committee for Program and Coordination

26th session (New York, Apr. 28–May 23)

Representative: Joseph Verner Reed, Jr.

Alternates: Richard A. Kramer; Edmond A. McGill; Richard T. Miller; Richard C. Nygard; Jack P. Orlando

Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs

21st session (Rome, May 26–June 6)

Representative *Ex Officio*: Millicent Fenwick

Representative: Melvin E. Sims

Alternate: Willard Pearson

22d session (Rome, Oct. 20–31)

Representative *Ex Officio*: Millicent Fenwick

Representative: Julia Chang Bloch

Alternates: Antonio Gayoso; James Ross

Committee on Natural Resources

Did not meet in 1986

Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Program (UNHCR)

37th session (Geneva, Oct. 6–13)

Representative: Jonathan Moore

Alternate: Ronald Flack; Robert L. Funseth

Commission on Human Settlements

(Istanbul, May 5–16)

Representative: Pamela Hussey

Alternate: Edward C. Bittner

Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development

8th session (New York, June 2–6)

Representative: James Ferrer, Jr.

Governing Council for UNDP

33d session (Geneva, June 2–27)

Representatives: M. Peter McPherson; Joseph V. Reed;

Gerald P. Carmen; Nyle Brady

Alternate: Antonio Gayoso

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA

Industrial Development Board of UNIDO
(Vienna, May 12-16; Oct. 13-23)

Representative: Bruce K. Chapman
Alternate: Norman H. Frisbie

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
90th session: FAO Council (Rome, Nov 17-28)
Representative: Millicent Fenwick
Alternate: James E. Ross

International Maritime Organization (IMO)
56th session: Council (London, June 16-20)
Representative: David L. Schiel
Alternates: Paul E. Versaw; Gerard P. Yoest

57th session: Council (London, Nov. 10-14)
Representative: J. Anthony
Alternates: G.T. Morgan; Gerard P. Yoest

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)
U.S. Governor: Robert E. Keating
Alternate: Hugh W. Foster

International Development Association (IDA)
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director, and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD

International Finance Corporation (IFC)
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director, and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
26th session: Triennial Assembly (Montreal, Sept. 23-Oct. 10)
Chief Delegate *Ex Officio*: Edmund Stohr
Chief Delegate: Donald D. Engen

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Governing Council ((Paris, Jan. 21-24)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Millicent Fenwick
Representative: Richard A. Derham

Governing Council (Rome, Dec. 9-12)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Millicent Fenwick
Representative: Richard A. Bissell

International Telecommunications Union (ITU)
Administrative Council (Geneva, June 16-27)
Representative: Earl S. Barbely

Universal Postal Union (UPU)
(Bern, Apr. 21-May 8)
Head of Delegation: Walter E. Duka
Alternate: Thomas Leavey

World Health Organization (WHO)

39th session (Geneva, May 5-16)

Delegates: Otis R. Brown; C. Everett Koop; Gerald P. Carmen
Alternates: Frank E. Young; Neil A. Boyer; Kenneth J. Bart;
Thomas E. Malone

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

1986 session of WIPO governing bodies (Geneva, Sept. 8-12)

Representative: Donald J. Quigg;

Alternates: Michael K. Kirk; Harvey J. Winter

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

38th session: Executive Committee (Geneva, June 2-16)

Member: Richard E. Hallgren

Alternate: Clifford J. Murino

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Board of Governors (Vienna, Feb. 18-20)

Extraordinary session (Vienna, May 21; June 10-14)

Special Session (Vienna, Dec. 8-9)

Representative: Richard T. Kennedy

Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

International Labor Organization (ILO)

232d session: Governing Body (Geneva, Feb. 24-Mar. 7)

Representative *Ex Officio*: Gerald P. Carmen

Representative: Robert W. Searby

233d session: Governing Body (Geneva, May 26-31)

Representative *Ex Officio*: Gerald P. Carmen

Acting Representative: Tadd Linsenmayer

234th session: Governing Body (Geneva, Nov. 10-21)

Representative: Robert W. Searby

*UN International Institute for the Unification of
Private Law (UNIDROIT)*

Governing Council (Rome, Apr. 7-12)

Representative: E. Allan Farnsworth

Alternate: Peter H. Pfund

APPENDIX 5

Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations

The scale of assessments for the contributions of Member States to the UN budget for the financial years 1986, 1987, and 1988 shall be as follows:

Member State	Percent	Member State	Percent
Afghanistan	0.01	Comoros	0.01
Albania	0.01	Congo	0.01
Algeria	0.14	Costa Rica	0.02
Angola	0.01	Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)	0.02
Antigua and Barbuda	0.01	Cuba	0.09
Argentina	0.62	Cyprus	0.02
Australia	1.66	Czechoslovakia	0.70
Austria	0.74	Democratic Kampuchea	0.01
Bahamas	0.01	Democratic Yemen	0.01
Bahrain	0.02	Denmark	0.72
Bangladesh	0.02	Djibouti	0.01
Barbados	0.01	Dominica	0.01
Belgium	1.18	Dominican Republic	0.03
Belize	0.01	Ecuador	0.03
Benin	0.01	Egypt	0.07
Bhutan	0.01	El Salvador	0.01
Bolivia	0.01	Equatorial Guinea	0.01
Botswana	0.01	Ethiopia	0.01
Brazil	1.40	Fiji	0.01
Brunei Darussalam	0.04	Finland	0.50
Bulgaria	0.16	France	6.37
Burkina Faso	0.01	Gabon	0.03
Burma	0.01	Gambia	0.01
Burundi	0.01	Germany, Dem. Rep. of	1.33
Byelorussian S.S.R.	0.34	Germany, Fed. Rep. of	8.26
Cameroon	0.01	Ghana	0.01
Canada	3.06	Greece	0.44
Cape Verde	0.01	Grenada	0.01
Central African Rep.	0.01	Guatemala	0.02
Chad	0.01	Guinea	0.01
Chile	0.07	Guinea-Bissau	0.01
China	0.79		
Colombia	0.13		

Member State	Percent	Member State	Percent
Guyana	0.01	Philippines	0.10
Haiti	0.01	Poland	0.64
Honduras	0.01	Portugal	0.18
Hungary	0.22	Qatar	0.04
Iceland	0.03	Romania	0.19
India	0.35	Rwanda	0.01
Indonesia	0.14	St. Kitts and Nevis	0.01
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	0.63	St. Lucia	0.01
Iraq	0.12	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01
Ireland	0.18	Samoa	0.01
Israel	0.22	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01
Italy	3.79	Saudi Arabia	0.97
Jamaica	0.02	Senegal	0.01
Japan	10.84	Seychelles	0.01
Jordan	0.01	Sierra Leone	0.01
Kenya	0.01	Singapore	0.10
Kuwait	0.29	Solomon Islands	0.01
Laos	0.01	Somalia	0.01
Lebanon	0.01	South Africa	0.44
Lesotho	0.01	Spain	2.03
Liberia	0.01	Sri Lanka	0.01
Libya	0.26	Sudan	0.01
Luxembourg	0.05	Suriname	0.01
Madagascar	0.01	Swaziland	0.01
Malawi	0.01	Sweden	1.25
Malaysia	0.10	Syrian Arab Republic	0.04
Maldives	0.01	Tanzania, United Rep. of	0.01
Mali	0.01	Thailand	0.09
Malta	0.01	Togo	0.01
Mauritania	0.01	Trinidad and Tobago	0.04
Mauritius	0.01	Tunisia	0.03
Mexico	0.89	Turkey	0.34
Mongolia	0.01	Uganda	0.01
Morocco	0.05	Ukrainian S.S.R.	1.28
Mozambique	0.01	U.S.S.R.	10.20
Nepal	0.01	United Arab Emirates	0.18
Netherlands	1.74	United Kingdom	4.86
New Zealand	0.24	United States	25.00
Nicaragua	0.01	Uruguay	0.04
Niger	0.01	Vanuatu	0.01
Nigeria	0.19	Venezuela	0.60
Norway	0.54	Viet Nam	0.01
Oman	0.02	Yemen	0.01
Pakistan	0.06	Yugoslavia	0.46
Panama	0.02	Zaire	0.01
Papua New Guinea	0.01	Zambia	0.01
Paraguay	0.02	Zimbabwe	0.02
Peru	0.07	Grand total	100.00

In accordance with Rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, States which are not Members of the United Nations but which participate in certain of its activities shall be called upon to contribute toward the 1986, 1987, and 1988 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

Non-member State	Percent	Non-member State	Percent
Holy See	0.01	Nauru	0.01
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	0.05	San Marino	0.01
Korea, Republic of	0.20	Switzerland	1.12
Liechtenstein	0.01	Tonga	0.01
Monaco	0.01	Tuvalu	0.01



* 300000028157Q *



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE LIBRARY
2201 C Street N.W., Room 3239
Washington, D.C. 20520

DATE DUE:

JUN 27 2014

1986 PR

